

VOLUME 18

NUMBER 4

PRICE 8p



Christian Order

Summary of Contents for April 1977

COMMUNISM AND THE
CHURCH: 1

The Editor

A LETTER TO THE
EDITOR

Bishop B. C. Butler

THE UN-MAKING OF
CATHOLIC CATECHETICS

Canon George Telford

NOTES ON MYSTERIUM
ECCLESIAE

W. H. Marshner

CANDID COMMENTARY

Paul Crane, S.J.

Pro Fide

Father Paul Crane, S.J.

**“Ourselves and the
Church”**

on

Sunday, May 8th at 3 p.m.

at

**Alton Community Centre,
Bessborough Road, London, SW 15**

followed by

Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament at 5.15

at

St. Joseph's Church, Roehampton Lane, S.W. 15.

Refreshments Available

Underground to Putney Bridge and 85 Bus to the "Lord Spencer" and 3 minutes walk to Alton Community Centre at corner of Bessborough and Alton Rds. OR Southern Railway to Putney and 85 Bus as above.

Inquiries to: Mr. W. H. Whittle (Phone 460-5329);
Mr. C. W. Sander (Phone 460-1832).

Contents

Page

194	AUTHORITY ALL ROUND	<i>The Editor</i>
199	THE UN-MAKING OF CATHOLIC CATECHETICS	<i>Canon George Telford</i>
207	A LETTER TO THE EDITOR	<i>Bishop Butler</i>
211	DON'T SELL OUT THE CHURCHES	<i>Archbishop J. Dwyer</i>
215	COMMUNISM AND THE CHURCH: 1	<i>The Editor</i>
226	AD MAIOREM DEI GLORIAM	<i>Niall Montgomery</i>
235	NOTES ON MYSTERIUM ECCLESIAE	<i>W. H. Marshner</i>
240	FURTHER THOUGHTS ON THE PUBLIC SECTOR	<i>J. M. Jackson</i>
248	ANY QUESTIONS?	<i>William Lawson, S.J.</i>
252	BOOK REVIEW	<i>Paul Crane, S.J.</i>

If You Change Your Address:
Please let us know two or
three weeks ahead if possible
and please send us both new
and old addresses. Thank you.

Christian Order is a
monthly magazine devoted
to the promulgation of
Catholic Social Teaching and
incisive comment on current
affairs in Church and State;
at home and abroad; in the
political, social and in-
dustrial fields.

It is published by Father
Paul Crane, S.J., from 65,
Belgrave Rd., London,
S.W.1. This is the sole postal
address to which all com-
munications concerning
Christian Order should be
sent.

Christian Order is ob-
tainable only by subscription
and from this address. In the
case of those desiring more
than one copy, these are
obtainable at the sub-
scription rate and should be
paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to
Christian Order is £1 in the
United Kingdom and
Republic of Ireland; \$3.00 in
the United States, Canada
and Australia; elsewhere,
according to the ap-
proximate sterling rate of
exchange, in the currency of
the country concerned or
any convenient currency.

Air-mail rates as follows:
U.S.A., Canada
India, etc. — £4.00, U.S.
\$8.00
Australia — £4.50, A. \$8.00
N. Zealand — £4.50, N.Z.
\$8.00.

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 18

APRIL, 1977

NUMBER 4

Authority All Round

THE EDITOR

"ONE IS the Church, which 'after his Resurrection our Saviour handed over to Peter as Shepherd (Jn. 21/17), commissioning him and the other Apostles to propagate and govern her (Mt. 18/18 seq.) (and which) He erected for all ages as 'the pillar and mainstay of the truth' (1 Tim. 3/15)'. And this Church of Christ, 'constituted and organised in this world as a society, subsists in the Catholic Church, which is governed by the Successor of Peter and the bishops in union with that Successor' (Vatican II, *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, 8)."

This passage is not taken from the latest Agreed Statement on *Authority in the Church*, published in January of this year by the Anglo-Roman Catholic International Commission. I only wish that it were; but it is not. It is taken, in fact, from the *Declaration in Defence of the Catholic Doctrine on the Church against Certain Errors of the Present Day*, which is known for short by the two opening Latin words of its original text, "*Mysterium Ecclesiae*". This Declaration, drawn up by the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, was ratified and confirmed on May 11th, 1973 by the Holy Father, who ordered its publication. It is published by the Catholic Truth Society. It should be taken as a large dose immediately before or after reading *Authority in the Church*; preferably before.

In view of the passage quoted above — to say nothing of the wealth of traditional and conciliar doctrinal statement that upholds the Petrine texts as central to the establishment of Peter's primacy over the Church and that of his Pope-

Successors — I find it most peculiar that there should be no mention of these texts at any point in the central exposition of this latest Agreed Statement. This, indeed, is Hamlet without the Prince. The central exposition takes up very nearly the first 12 of the Statement's actual 14½ pages. We get to the only mention of the Petrine texts at the top of the thirteenth page (nineteenth in the pamphlet containing the Statement). They merit exactly 6 lines comprising one sub-section under a penultimate section entitled "Problems and Prospect". Apparently, they constitute a problem, for this is what the 6 lines say:

"Claims on behalf of the Roman See as commonly presented in the past have put a greater weight on the Petrine texts (Matt. 16/18; Luke 22/31,32; John 21,15-17) than they are generally thought to be able to bear. However, many Roman Catholic scholars (Bishops Butler, Clark et. al.?) do not now feel it necessary to stand by former exegesis of these texts in every respect."

In other words and by implication — or is this too brutal? — doctrine should be bent or rendered ambiguous in the interests of "unity", as was the case with the previous Statements on the Eucharist and the Ministry.

Vatican I had something important to say on this point and it is cited approvingly in the following passage from *Mysterium Ecclesiae*, which I quote at some length because of its importance in this context:

"As for the meaning of dogmatic formulas, this remains ever true and constant in the Church, even when it is expressed with greater clarity or more developed. The Faithful, therefore, must shun the opinion, first, that dogmatic formulas (or some category of them) cannot signify truth in a determinate way, but can only offer changeable approximations to it, which to a certain extent distort or alter it; secondly, that these formulas signify the truth only in an indeterminate way, this truth being like a goal that is constantly being sought by means of such approximations. Those who hold such an opinion do not avoid dogmatic relativism and they corrupt the concept

of the Church's infallibility relative to the truth to be taught or held in a determinate way.

"Such an opinion clearly is in disagreement with the declarations of the First Vatican Council, which, while fully aware of the progress of the Church in her knowledge of revealed truth, nevertheless taught as follows: 'That meaning of sacred dogmas . . . must always be maintained which Holy Mother Church declared once and for all, nor should one ever depart from that meaning under the guise of or in the name of a more advanced understanding'. The Council moreover condemned the opinion that 'dogmas once proposed by the Church must with the progress of science be given a meaning other than that which was understood by the Church, or which she understands'. There is no doubt that, according to these texts of the (First Vatican) Council, the meaning of dogmas which is declared by the Church is determinate and unalterable."

From which it follows that if the Church has declared dogmatically, as she has, that Primacy (juridical and governing power) over the Church He founded (which is the Catholic Church and no other) has been given by Christ Our Lord to Peter the Apostle and his successors, then it has in fact been so given and the argument stops there. As Pope Boniface I wrote in 419: "Our judgment is not to be discussed again, for it has never been permissible to treat again of a matter that has once been decided by the Apostolic See". Modern theologians (Bishops Butler, Clark et al.) may think it frightfully unsporting of Pope Boniface to have carried on like this; but, then, he did not believe in accommodating doctrine to his modern world. He thought it ought to be held up before all men; and he expected the world to hate him for so doing because that, precisely, is what Christ, his Lord and Master, had said it would do.

Why, then, in this Agreed Statement on Authority, are those Petrine texts played down which are central to the dogmatic teaching of the Catholic Church concerning the primacy of St. Peter and his Successor Popes? Precisely because, I believe, the teaching is thought by Catholic representatives on the Commission too hard for Anglicans to

bear. Therefore, their argument would seem to run, accomodate Catholic doctrine to the weakness of Anglicans in order to bring them into the Church (It will, of course, keep the best of them out). This makes truth, by implication, indeterminate and relative. Does it represent the mind of Catholic members of the Commission? If it does, then words already quoted from *Mysterium Ecclesiae* most certainly apply. Here they are once again:

"Those who hold such an opinion do not avoid dogmatic relativism and they corrupt the concept of the Church's infallibility relative to the truth to be taught or held in a determinate way".

In other words, they are Neo-Modernists, for this, precisely, is what Modernism is.

A great deal more could be said about this Statement. It appears to see the Primacy of the Pope — quite illicitly I would suggest — as the result primarily of the growth in esteem over the years of the See of Rome. In other words, the See gave the Pope a significance out of which a primacy of "oversight" came to be accepted; whereas, in fact (and despite what the Statement says), it was exactly the other way round — the primacy (juridical and governing power over the Church) that Christ gave to Peter and his Successor Popes gave prestige to the See they occupied. (Every Catholic kid knows this — or did before the proponents of the New Catechetics in what is quaintly called the "Post-Conciliar Church" began to throw their nonsense at him.) Moreover, the comparison, as it appears in the text of this Statement, between the primacy of "oversight", gradually assumed by an Archbishop over his Suffragans, and that of the Bishop of Rome over the Dioceses of the Catholic Church throughout the world, strikes me as strained and, indeed, thoroughly bad history, illicit and unsound.

Worse; at the end of a second very careful reading of this Statement, I was left with the overriding impression that it can be described very fairly as essentially contrived and with one aim in view — "Reunion all Round", as the late Mgr. Ronald Knox had it; and at just about any price. Which means, of course, no reunion at all; only anarchy. For this reason I can only conclude that this third Agreed Statement will do a great deal more harm than good.

The letter here published as an article is the explanatory letter which accompanied Canon George Telford's recent resignation as Vice-Chairman and Secretary to the Department for Catechetics, of the Education Commission of the Bishops' National Conference of England and Wales. The Episcopal Chairman of this Department is Bishop Michael Bowen, Bishop of Arundel and Brighton. This letter was sent also to all members of the hierarchy of England and Wales, to Rome, and to all leading figures in the Catechetical life of the Catholic Church in England and Wales. We publish it because of the serious doctrinal issues involved, and because it represents a doctrinal war in the heart of the Church which will not go away by being ignored, either at Westminster, or in Rome, or elsewhere. Since this letter represents a drastic and sacrificial decision in conscience on the part of Canon George Telford, and has been widely supplied by him, there is no breach of confidence entailed in our publishing it: indeed, we have his explicit permission to do so. It is difficult to overestimate the significance of Canon Telford's testimony in view of his deep involvement with the Catechetical movement, both national and international over the past decade or so. With acknowledgements and grateful thanks to Canon Telford and the Editor of *Faith*, a magazine which we commend to our readers.

The Un-making of Catholic Catechetics

CANON GEORGE TELFORD

De Rosa Invokes the Dialectic

MY EARLY misgivings regarding the theology of catechetical renewal were confirmed by the events following the publication of *Humanae Vitae*. It was evident to me that the rebellion fomented by Corpus Christi College and others was not motivated merely by intellectual difficulties inherent in the doctrine itself. It was rather that the encyclical presented a unique opportunity to ridicule, discredit, and ultimately deny, the Church's authority to teach. Peter De Rosa expressed this admirably in the autumn of 1968, when he told angry catechetical directors at Corpus Christi College: 'History shows that progress can be achieved only through conflict between the establishment and the thinkers.'

The memory of De Rosa and his colleagues is gradually fading, but the principle he enunciated took firm root, and continues to be applied in catechetical circles to this day. It means, in effect, that catechesis must be drawn from the speculations of 'progressive' theologians, the conclusions of discussion groups, and the resolutions of catechetical conferences — because it is among these that 'the thinkers' are to be found. The declarations of popes, councils and hierarchies are merely the effusions of 'the establishment', and therefore to be contended. In practice, however, it is better to ridicule them in private and ignore them in public — or to eliminate them from catechesis by a process of gradual dilution. Ambiguity is also an important part of the technique: if applied skilfully, it becomes possible to talk and write about essential doctrines in a manner quite unrelated, or even contradictory, to anything taught by the Church. The golden rule is to avoid all clear and explicit statements.

I do not assert that all those at present in positions of responsibility have evaluated it at all. Many of them are nice people who gradually succumb to the atmosphere of camaraderie engendered at conferences. If they have doubts they do not voice them — through fear of that dreaded label 'Reactionary'.

While Peter De Rosa was holding forth in the media as the champion of human freedom in the struggle against papal oppression, I wrote to Cardinal Heenan, resigning from the Board of Governors of Corpus Christi College. He subsequently talked me out of this with the promise that 'something will be done'. After a few months, when it appeared that in fact nothing was being done, I went to see the Cardinal again. He then told me that he was afraid to take any action over Corpus Christi College or any of its staff because 'it would lead to a revolution throughout the country compared to which the *Humanae Vitae* revolt would be insignificant'. I insisted that this was a totally unrealistic view — but to no avail.

At the next Governors' meeting, Hubert Richards and Peter De Rosa voiced their perennial complaint that the College was not supported by the Bishops. I said that the obvious reason for this was their lack of confidence in the theology taught there. I quoted from an article in the current *Sower*, in which Fr. Francis Somerville demanded that the Church should recognise 'pluralism in theology'. I asked for a clarification: What was meant here by 'pluralism'? Did it mean that there were now two magisteria, the Church and 'the theologians', each presenting different — even contradictory — truths? Cardinal Heenan said: 'I think you have put your finger on the nub of the problem', and invited Richards and De Rosa to comment. When they declined to do so, the Cardinal proposed an extraordinary meeting in two months' time, exclusively to discuss this matter. I began to be hopeful at last.

When the meeting took place, however, it seemed that the Cardinal had undergone a complete change of mind on the matter. He quoted the Molinist v. Thomist controversy regarding grace and freewill as an example of 'pluralism', and said that the Church had always granted such freedom to theologians. This was hardly a parallel! But the Cardinal would permit no further debate. He announced his intention

to reconstitute the College as a diocesan institution, as distinct from national, saying 'The Bishops may not believe in Corpus Christi College, but I do'. The nationally-constituted Governing Body was then ipso facto dissolved, and I do not know what, if anything, succeeded it.

The Bishops Forced to See

In December 1971, the whole Hierarchy were summoned to a three-day conference at Corpus Christi College, for the avowed purpose of entering into meaningful dialogue with the staff and students. Many key theological issues were debated, but it was impossible to get a straight answer to a straight question. If one naively asked: 'Is Christ truly the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity?', or: 'Was Christ truly conceived by the Holy Spirit, without human intercourse?', the invariable reply was: 'That's the wrong question'. Great volumes of verbiage would then follow by way of explanation, in which the Good News of Salvation emerged as a kind of existentialist nightmare. Some of the students, it seemed, had not yet acquired the skills of theological gobbledehoo, and were more explicit regarding their beliefs. Bishop Grant reported to the conference, with utter incredulity: 'I've just had lunch with a student who doesn't believe in the existence of the soul!' I said to him: "Let's get this straight — if you died tomorrow, would you continue to exist?" He replied: "Well, only in my mother's memory, and that sort of thing. . . ."

The hottest debate was regarding the Resurrection: Was it, or was it not, a dogmatic fact? From the Corpus Christi side, there was the inevitable absence of anything resembling a categorical statement. There was, however, an evident contempt for anyone so theologically clueless as to believe that the Resurrection did, actually, happen. Some of the more magnanimous said they didn't mind either way. Amid the endless wrangling and juggling with words, Bishop Holland's clear, incisive interventions came as moments of light and sanity in three very bleak days.

Corpus Christi College was finally closed in the following July. The national revolution feared by Cardinal Heenan did not take place. The trendy theological journals rallied all their resources to boost the affair as yet another glorious martyrdom in the cause of academic freedom. This was, of

course, entirely predictable. I was, however, surprised when Cardinal Heenan said, in his public statement, that he had himself 'never had any doubts regarding the orthodoxy of what was taught at Corpus Christi College'. Only a few months previously, the Cardinal had told me privately: 'From a recent conversation I have had with Bert Richards, it is quite evident to me that he no longer believes in the Blessed Trinity or the Incarnation in a Catholic sense'.

In May 1969, the Council for Catechetics held its inaugural meeting. Given the appalling tensions then prevailing in the catechetical world, and the Council's membership ('representative of all approaches to religious education'), it was doomed from the start to fail in any worthwhile purpose. Bishop Burke, the Episcopal Chairman, was faced with an utterly impossible task.

The Corpus Christi representatives, and their fellow-travellers, saw the Council as a platform from which their cause could be promoted. Every meeting was the occasion of thinly-disguised conflict, in an atmosphere of often near-neurotic tension. As Secretary, I found it very tedious to write minutes in which 'leading catechists' would hold forth on such themes as 'We are only now beginning to understand what the Eucharist is all about . . .', and regale everyone with accounts of how their enlightened catechesis was bringing countless thousands out of ignorance and error in which they had languished for so many years.

Establishment Humanists Dig in . . .

Demands for funds, buildings and status were continually made through the Council, for the more efficient dissemination of these 'new insights'. The reason for the Hierarchy's resistance was always abundantly clear to me — but progressive Council members attributed it merely to 'lack of awareness . . .'

In 1972, the Council for Catechetics was replaced by the present Department of Catechetics. This is a much smaller commission of people of moderate views, under the chairmanship of Bishop Bowen. This Department is a vast improvement on the former Council, but I do not believe it has the power or prestige to take effective action against the situation described above — which STILL prevails as

strongly as it did ten years ago, even though many of its leading personalities are no longer with us. Fr. Kevin Nichols has been given the task of producing what will be in effect a National Catechetical Directory. I am sure Fr. Nichols will do his work conscientiously, but he is being called upon to produce a document which will be 'acceptable to all sides'. Fr. Nichols has already commented on the extreme difficulty of 'reconciling' the views of 'various theologians', even on so fundamental a concept as revelation. Fr. Nichols is too polite: I would say that it is not merely 'difficult' but impossible, and predict that Fr. Nichols' painstaking work will result in a document which is ineffective because it cannot be explicit and positive about the things that matter most.

The National Board of Religious Advisers (i.e., directors of diocesan catechetical centres) is by far the most influential body. Many of the priests and nuns on the Board are graduates of the former Corpus Christi College. Richards and De Rosa are revered by them as pioneers of progress who were finally crushed by the relentless tyranny of 'the establishment'. However, the torch they enkindled is still nobly borne by their disciples. Fr. Anthony Bullen's article in *The Tablet* of 27th March, 1976 provides a typical example. In it, he reiterates and extols the Richards thesis, viz. that the Resurrection as a dogmatic fact is quite irrelevant. However, as soon as one is convinced that it never really happened, it takes on a significance hitherto undreamed of. Fr. Bullen points out that the wisdom of this is apparent only to those who have a 'maturity of thought, an appreciation of subtleties, a sensitivity to poetic feeling, which only an experienced and theologically competent catechist can cope with'. Fr. Bullen himself, of course, possesses all these desirable qualities. When I learned about gnosticism during my seminary course, I never imagined that it would emerge again in my own life-time, with such staggering self-assurance!

My first major confrontation with the National Board of Religious Advisers took place in the spring of 1971. In July of the previous year, I had had the audacity to publish an article in *The Universe* which strongly criticised the doctrinal basis of contemporary catechetics. I had not imagined that this would endear me to my brethren in catechetics. Even so, I was surprised at the vehemence of their reaction. At the

following annual conference at Park Place, I was angrily taken to task for not following the party line. In the course of my 'trial', I asked that if Peter De Rosa could write in *Time* magazine of Pope Paul and *Humanae Vitae*: 'He is wrong, utterly wrong, and I will shout it from the roof tops' — why might I not be allowed the same liberty to criticise contemporary catechetical approaches?

The inevitable outcome was that I was voted out of the chair (which I had occupied uneasily for about a year), and Fr. David Konstant was voted in. My appearances at annual conferences have, understandably perhaps, been rather brief since then — but more than adequate to observe that the spirit of esoteric enlightenment is growing with each succeeding year.

New Humanist Attack Beginning now

This month I trailed up to London Colney to the conference, but remained for only one session, during which unanimous resolutions were pressed for the substitution of general absolution for private confession — for young children (because they can't really make a confession anyway); for adolescents (because they are so mixed up). With regard to adults, the obligation to confess after general absolution should be abolished, because, as one of the periti put it: 'It looks to people as if the Church is giving it to them with one hand and taking it away with the other'. What exactly 'it' was in this context was not specified. Another peritus was emboldened to stand up and make sure that Bishop Bowen had got the message: 'You realise, My Lord, that we are asking for a change in the rules'.

The Bishop indeed pointed out that there was no reference in all this to the Holy See's directive regarding the use of general absolution, and that in Holland, the widespread use of general absolution had led to the virtual disappearance of private confession. This made no apparent impression. His Lordship might also have added that their proposals were contrary to the Church's pastoral tradition over many centuries, to the clearly-expressed mind of recent popes, and to the Canons of the Council of Trent. But it would have been to no avail. Here was yet one more example of the inevitable conflict between the thinkers and the

establishment — the only way in which progress can be achieved. . . .

This dossier could be expanded indefinitely, but I hope that the above will suffice to indicate my reasons for contracting out of any implication with, or responsibility for, national catechetical policy or structures. It is fashionable these days to speak of 'credibility gaps'. My own credibility gap is not with regard to the Church, but the catechetical establishment, and the theology underlying its policies and structures. I simply do not believe in it. Fr. Herbert McCabe once wrote that the Church is 'corrupt' thus aligning himself firmly with 'the thinkers'. I would maintain equally that 'modern catechetics' is theologically corrupt and spiritually bankrupt. Its strictures and innovations are irrelevant and unmeaningful for Catholic faith, and can achieve nothing but its gradual dilution. The authentic renewal of catechesis will come not from then, but from the Faithful.

FOLLOW-UP

(From Mr. P. F. X. Swarbrick)

In the Autumn of this year, 1977, the World Synod of Bishops will meet in Rome to discuss the subject of Catechetics for children and young people.

In his letter to the Hierarchy of England and Wales printed above and which accompanied his resignation as Vice-Chairman and Secretary to the Department of Catechetics, Canon Telford maintains that "Modern Catechetics (are) theologically corrupt and spiritually bankrupt". If you agree with the sentiments expressed in Canon Telford's letter you are asked to give your utmost support to the Plea, which will be submitted to the Hierarchy of England and Wales, along with Canon Telford's letter, at their Low Week Conference prior to the World Synod of Bishops. A copy of the Plea with accompanying signatures and a copy of Canon Telford's letter will be sent to Rome also for consideration by the World Synod of Bishops. It is essential that there should be a massive sign-in if the Plea is to have the desired effect. The sign-in is limited to readers of Christian Order in England and Wales. They are asked to do their utmost in this matter. Priest-readers, in particular, are asked to go all out.

Copies of the Plea may be obtained only from the Organiser, Mr. P. F. X. Swarbrick, 52 Moorcroft Crescent Ribbleton, Preston PR2 6DP. All you have to do is send a stamped and addressed envelope with your request. If you want more than one copy increase the postage on the stamped and addressed envelope, but remember, please each copy of the Plea has room for many signatures. Speed is of the essence of this effort. Please go all out to have signed copies of the plea in to Mr. Swarbrick by mid-April if at all possible; by the end of April at the latest. Let us not fail our children in this matter. Their Faith deserves the tremendous effort we must make at once.

A specimen copy of the Plea is reproduced below.

PLEA TO THE HIERARCHIES OF ENGLAND AND WALES FOR THE RESTORATION OF SOUND ORTHODOX CATHOLIC DOCTRINE IN MANY OF OUR SCHOOLS

Your Eminence, Your Graces, Your Lordships,

Having read the letter which accompanied Canon George Telford's resignation as Vice-Chairman and Secretary of the Hierarchy's Department of Catechetics, we are profoundly disturbed to learn of his description of *Modern Catechetics* as being 'theologically corrupt and spiritually bankrupt'.

There is no doubt that Canon Telford's assertions are correct when one considers the extent of the drift from the Faith by so many young people today who have been to, or are attending Catholic Schools.

We are fully aware that what is at stake is nothing less than the Faith of our children and that of future generations of Catholics.

As our Shepherds and Teachers, we beg Your Lordships to use all your influence to bring about a change in the present situation, fearlessly to proclaim Catholic Truth, in season, out of season . . . and to insist that orthodox Catholic doctrine is taught in *all* our schools.

Finally, may we respectfully remind Your Lordships that what we ask for our children is their God-given right — and ours.

Signed:

Name:

Address (BLOCKS PLEASE)

Very courteously Bishop Butler requested permission to reply to the three letters the Editor wrote him in the December, January and February numbers of *Christian Order*. The Editor acceded at once to his request, though *Christian Order* is not primarily a forum for discussion. There are always exceptions and this was obviously one. The length of Bishop Butler's reply was left entirely to his discretion. His letter is printed below exactly as he wrote it. Printing schedules make this month the earliest for its publication.

A Letter to the Editor

BISHOP B. C. BUTLER

Dear Editor,

I am most genuinely grateful for the opportunity to make some response to the three letters you addressed to me in recent numbers of *Christian Order*. I feel sure that a sympathetic exchange of views, underpinned by a real desire for mutual understanding, could be of immense value in the painful but hopeful period through which we are passing in the history of the Church.

To be fruitful of good, such discussions need to rest upon an agreed basis. And this we have, in our mutual adhesion to the Sacred Tradition and the defined doctrine of the Catholic Church and in our unconditional loyalty to that Church as the divinely guaranteed communion of the faithful.

My task is made to some extent easier by the fact that your criticisms of my two articles in *The Tablet* concentrate themselves in the main on two passages in the second of these articles. The first article you leave, in large measure, untouched. I think, however, that you supposed — and the fault may have been mine — that I was writing a defence not only of the second Vatican Council but of the way in which our affairs have been conducted in the years subsequent to

the Council. My purpose was somewhat different: to help an intelligent layman, who lives in France, to endure the contemporary Church even if he disliked nearly everything in it that distinguishes it from the pre-conciliar Church with which he and I were familiar. My point was that the Church remains herself not only despite change, but often through change. My desire was, not to justify the mode of government of today's Church authorities, but to help the faith of someone who was tempted to doubt whether the Church he had joined many years ago survived at all.

May I turn without more ado to a point of fundamental importance? You suggest that in my reference to Archbishop Lefebvre I failed to take account of the possibility that the Archbishop may find himself obliged in conscience to resist the authority of the Pope. Let me say at once, that I am utterly convinced that everyone must follow his conscience. And I do not think that I anywhere in my articles suggested that Archbishop Lefebvre is not obeying his conscience.

My second comment is quite secondary, but not unimportant. A man must follow his conscience even when that conscience is invincibly erroneous. But the fact that he must follow it does not cancel out the fact that an erroneous conscience is erroneous. And if one man's erroneous conscience leads and obliges him to behaviour that creates moral danger for others, it may be right for someone else to point out that it is erroneous. I should be sorry to have to consider everyone who disagrees with me as morally bad; but I should also be sorry to have to believe that everything done by such a man is objectively unexceptionable just because it may be presumed to be subjectively innocent.

I have no wish whatever to belabour Archbishop Lefebvre. But, despite your questioning, I do think that there is a difference of gravity between the disobedience of a priest who says Mass without wearing the prescribed vestments and that of an archbishop who publicly flaunts the whole college of bishops in the person of its earthly head by continuing to say Mass in public when forbidden to do so in the most explicit way by that supreme pontiff. Whether the Pope has used his powers justly in this matter I am not competent to judge. But you may remember St. Augustine's teaching, that even a sentence of excommunication (and Archbishop Lefebvre has not been excommunicated) may be

unjust, but nevertheless has to be obeyed. What is at stake here is, it seems to me, not just canon law but the visible unity and communion of the Church of God. I repeat that I am passing no judgement on Archbishop Lefebvre's conscience, nor doubting his obligation to follow it. I only say that his public defiance of the Pope, in the concrete circumstances, begins to look, objectively, like the sin of schism which Cajetan regarded as a sin formally against charity.

One further word in this connection. If Archbishop Lefebvre feels no nostalgia for the pre-conciliar Church, he must be almost unique among men of his and my age who loved that Church; nevertheless, I apologise for having used this word. But the point at issue is not nostalgia but the legitimacy of appealing from the Tradition as it lives in the Church of 1976/7 to that Tradition as it lived in a period now past. Was it not one of the basic errors of the Reformation to appeal from the contemporary Church to a more primitive form of Christianity?

In your second article you direct your attention to a passage in which I spoke of "a Catholicism which you can swallow whole and indiscriminately". You reply: "That is exactly what I do want, at least with regard to the essentials of my Faith". Obviously, we all want such a Catholicism, qualified as it is qualified in the last eight words quoted by me from you. But equally obviously, my articles were definite on the subject of this essential substratum. I was categorical that the Council had not changed defined doctrine, and I am glad to see that you now dispute this assertion. You ask, in a succeeding paragraph: "Why should I not want to swallow my Catholic faith whole and enquire?" Why not, indeed? But the passage in my article which prompts this question of yours is one in which I am not talking exclusively about "the Catholic Faith" but about "a Catholicism" that, as my words clearly show, is made up of all sorts of contingent and changeable things. You yourself agree that such changeable things cannot be "swallowed" indiscriminately — otherwise you would be compelled to swallow a great deal in contemporary Church practice which you plainly dislike intensely; and some of which I also dislike.

I entirely agree with you that one locus to which one has recourse in seeking to distinguish the Sacred Tradition from human accretions and even corruptions is devotional /

liturgical practice. I could even contemplate the possibility that we have recently played dangerously fast and loose with our legacy of such practice. But we must both admit that one cannot immediately deduce, for instance, from a cultus of an alleged relic that the relic itself is genuine — to offer one instance where discrimination is called for.

I have little that I wish to add here about your third article. There is much of it with which I am in sympathy. But I am sorry that anything that I may have said should have provoked you to your aside about Archbishop Helder Camara. For myself, I hold the view that when social, political and economic conditions reach a certain pitch of injustice and draw near to being intolerable, it may be a real act of "prophetic" witness for a Catholic, even if he is a bishop, to protest. I should like, in all good humour, to observe, with reference again to your third article, that it is possible to regret a Catholicism that offers a haven of peace, *but does not invite us to reflect on our religion and on the evils of society*; while still rejoicing that the Church is indeed a haven of peace. In my own second article I wrote: "I only know that here, in the bark of Peter, I have found security — but neither the assurance nor the experience of a calm crossing". The security of which I there wrote is not so far removed from the notion underlying the words: "a haven of peace".

I have passed over much in your three articles, just as you passed over much in my two articles. I recognise that our real differences extend far beyond those matters to which I have here directed my thoughts. But most of them are matters of opinion on which there can hardly hope to be agreement in a Church made up of Tom, Dick and Harry; a Church that is not a sect but the Catholic communion of all the faithful. What I think we must hold to is the principle: *in necessariis unitas* — that, and a great mutual charity, and an unshakeable trust in God who brought the Church through the Dark Ages and the Reformation and will certainly bring her through the turbulent waters that she is at present — rather clumsily? — trying to navigate.

+ B. C. Butler.

Archbishop Dwyer takes up those who spend a lot of time today talking about guilt-complexes and calling us to repentance for the supposed sins of the Church. Acknowledgements to "Twin Circle".

Don't Sell Out the Church

ARCHBISHOP ROBERT J. DWYER

IT HAS become stylish over the past few years for Catholics to go about in sackcloth and ashes, tearing their hair and beating their breasts, in repentance for the sins of their fathers.

It is a most edifying spectacle, recalling those penitential pilgrimages of old when men and women, disheveled and emaciated, with bleeding feet and streaming eyes, wended their way to some shrine, Santiago de Compostella or St. Patrick's Purgatory, in reparation for their sins.

The difference, minor though it might seem, is that the penitents of the past had in mind their own misdeeds and shortcomings, whereas your up-to-date Catholic isn't thinking of himself at all, certainly not of his own sins; he is thinking of those evil old men like Cajetan and Bellarmine who had the execrable judgment to engage in controversy with their Protestant brethren, long, long ago. Or he is harking back to Pio Nono, in the 1860's, and his secretary of state, Cardinal Antonelli, condemning Liberalism and preparing the ground for the proclamation of the dogma of papal infallibility. Or he is lamenting the insensitivity of St. Pius X in calling Modernism "the compendium of all the heresies."

Strange Approach

We stumbled across a conspicuous example of this new approach only the other day, where, in an invitation to the Protestant clergy of a certain area to share with their Catholic brethren in an ecumenical day of prayer (surely an

admirable gesture), it was specified that this was offered in the spirit of reparation for Trent. And the note went on to say that a similar gathering in the future might be conceived as doing something to repair the damage done by Vatican I.

To our dazzled eyes this opens up a vast and extremely tempting field.

In like vein a clambake might be arranged with Unitarian men of the cloth by way of apologizing for the Council of Nicaea and its heavy-handed definition of the Trinity, or with the Jewish rabbinate by way of a penitential rite expressing our regret for the unfortunate business of the Council of Jerusalem, so maladroitly handled by the bungling Peter.

Candidly, we are fairly swept off our feet by the almost limitless range of the prospect before us. Days of reparation might be appointed for the whole Church, so that the injustices and outrages inflicted on men like Galileo and Giordano Bruno might be forgiven, or the summary treatment accorded Martin Luther, who wanted only to make the Church over in his pattern — surely a blameless project — might be atoned for. Or we could beat a path to the neighbouring Protestant Episcopal church bearing large placards proclaiming our sorrow for the contumelious reaction of Rome to Bluff King Hal, when his conscience was so tender on the score of his marriage with Catherine of Aragon.

Public Penance

Again, turning to the national scene, would it not be appropriate for the Catholics of America to do public penance for the enormities of such ecclesiastical malefactors as Bishop John Carroll and Cardinal Gibbons, those narrow-minded and bigoted sectarians, who insisted so tiresomely on the unique truth and mission of the Church, when every sound Ecumenist today knows that she is only one establishment out of many, only one of the many mansions in the Father's House.

Would it not be an excellent idea, moreover, to appoint a day of fast and abstinence by way of expressing our regret over the whole dismal business of the Catholic school system. Let us admit, nay, shout from the housetops, its separatism and divisiveness, as pointed out by our great Supreme Court; let us agree with tears that it was all a mistake.

Our only fear, in thus contemplating the immediate future, is not indeed that we shall be in any danger of running short of material, but that we might surfeit by excess. There comes a fugitive suspicion, "a cloud no larger than a man's hand," that we might end up by boring everyone in sight, including ourselves. It is all very well for us to go hat in hand to proffer our regrets and apologies, or even to grovel in object abasement, to wallow naked, as Teddy Roosevelt might say, in repentance (be it remembered, of course, for the sins of others), but experience shows that a little of this goes a long way.

Now in the bad old days when one was occasionally permitted a Latin tag, the above could be described as a *reductio ad absurdum*, tearing a fallacy to tatters and exposing the ridiculous lengths to which it might be drawn. For the whole business of Catholic repentance for the sins of the fathers is that precisely; a fallacy. It confuses issues and principles with individuals, persons.

We can be sorry as we want for what churchmen in the past have done or failed to do; we can be grief-stricken over the obstinacies and stupidities of popes and prelates and priests, but let us take care that we stop short of calling in question the unerring guidance of the Holy Spirit, forever preserving the Church in holiness and freedom from doctrinal taint.

It is one thing to blame the method, to criticize the manner, it is something else again to make sport of the matter.

Take Trent, for example, that lengthy and argumentative conclave which went on in the little Tyrolean town for the better part of two decades, under several pontificates and the presidency of successive papal legates. Debate was remarkably free and open, and if it sometimes degenerated into personal recrimination, on the whole it reflected the dignity and seriousness of the Church at work on her own reformation. Perhaps greater and more persistent efforts could have been made to attract and hold Protestant representation at the Council, but it must not be forgotten that cordial overtures were made time and again, only to be met with rebuffs and in some instances with insults.

As to the dogmatic definitions of the Council, what exception can be taken to them unless one is to concede that the Lutheran and Calvinist reformers had the right to it? In the 140 pages of its decrees, all in fine print in the edition we have at hand, the bulk relates to justification, the sacraments, the Holy Sacrifice, Original Sin, and the general reform of religious and ecclesiastical life.

The dogmatic definitions, passed by a General Council and approved solemnly by the Pope, are irreformable; they carry the note of infallibility. To apologize for Trent in this sense is to sell out the Church. Empty all the vials of indignation you want on the heads of the offending fathers, but have a care when it comes to what they said as reflecting the very mind of God.

Vatican I

So too with Vatican I. No doubt Pio Nono was headstrong, bent on having his own way in the matter of the supreme papal prerogative, the infallibility of his teaching office as head of the Church and of the episcopal college. No question either that the history of his pontificate would make happier reading were it not for the somewhat baffling figure of Cardinal Antonelli, to whom the Pope was so stubbornly — and touchingly — loyal. Here again one may criticize the method, the exclusion of Protestants and Orthodox (though the latter received an invitation which was ignored), the friction and attrition of personalities as sharply diverse as Dupanloup and Manning.

But what of the dogmatic constitutions? In contrast with Trent they cover only 14 pages in our text; they touch on two main points, the meaning and nature of faith and revelation, and the Church infallible in her head.

Are these to be apologized for?

Then the Church is in error, she is no longer divine.

This is not ecumenism, it is a sell-out. It can neither gain the respect nor hold the interest of those, Protestants or Orthodox, who value convictions and fight for them.

For the Catholic it is nothing less than a repudiation of his mother, the Church, like kicking her in the teeth.

That it is becoming popular these days among a certain few is a commentary on the temper of the times.

Strange love!

Father Crane publishes this month the first of four articles designed to examine the extraordinary change that has come over the Church's attitude to Communism during the past fifteen years. The evolution of thought that has produced this attitude of anti-anti-Communism at all levels within the Church, including the highest, is studied in these articles. He is greatly indebted to Michael Davies excellent and just-published "Pope John's Council" for material used in this present article and he has drawn on "Marxism and the Church of Rome" (published by the Institute for the Study of Conflict) for further material used in this series. He takes the opportunity here of acknowledging his indebtedness to both sources and expressing his sincere thanks.

CURRENT COMMENT

Communism and the Church: 1

THE EDITOR

COMMUNISM has always regarded the Catholic Church as a very tough nut to crack. At the same time, it has always been confident that it could crack it; not all at once, but in time. And not by frontal assault, but by taking advantage of any weakness that might appear — or, indeed, that Communism itself might create — in the Church from within, suiting such weakness where possible to its own basic purpose of remaking the world in its image; which means, of course, the world's enslavement — Gulag all round.

Tragic Contrast

Weaknesses within the Church which suit Communist

purpose were revealed in — not made by — the Second Vatican Council and its aftermath. They did not come all at once — few weaknesses do — but had grown over the years. I want to trace that growth in this and three succeeding articles, picking out the main strands in the story as best I can. Parts of it will be familiar to readers of *Christian Order*. What I have to do here is to put the parts together and combine them with fresh material to paint what I believe is a true picture of Catholic mental and moral weakness in face of Communist pressure; something quite unthinkable twenty years or so ago. In illustration, let me take two incidents, key points in the tragic yet heroic life of one of the great churchmen of this (or any) century. At the time of Cardinal Mindszenty's trial and imprisonment by the Communists in 1949, Pope Pius XII refused to yield one inch to Communist pressure or to be in any way overawed by these brutal proceedings: "Can you imagine a successor of St. Peter who would bow to such demands"?, he asked a vast crowd present at a public audience. "No!", they roared back at the Holy Father, and the Pope continued: "The Pope, by divine promise is, even in his human weakness, invincible and unshakeable, herald of truth and justice, and of the various principles governing the unity of the Church". Twenty-five years later, on the anniversary of his arrest and imprisonment by the Communists, the great Cardinal was informed in Rome — to which, against his better judgment, he had come because bidden — that he had been deprived by Pope Paul VI of his double office as Archbishop of Esztergom and Primate of Hungary.

Background to Cardinal Mindszenty's Demotion

The contrast is both startling and complete. Neither must it be taken in isolation. It disturbs still more when words and deeds of other prelates are set alongside the demotion of Cardinal Mindszenty. I am thinking of Cardinal Alfrink's cable of congratulations, sent in the name of Pax Christi of which he is President, to the North Vietnamese after their culminating act of brutal aggression had brought the South to its knees in defeat. (Someone wondered at the time what the Dutch Catholics would have thought had the Primate of

Spain, say, sent a telegram to Hitler when his troops took Holland by an equally brutal act of aggression in 1940). Then there was that peculiar incident when Cardinal Gray of Edinburgh signed a petition, headed by the then Communist, Jimmy Reid, protesting against the bombing of North Vietnam. Round about this same time, if I remember rightly, the Jesuit Provincials of the North American Provinces of the Society had protested against the bombing. And some three years ago, at a great rally of the JOC in Paris, Cardinal Marty, flanked, it is said, by ten bishops, had taken his stand at the side of George Marchais, Secretary-General of the Communist Party of France, to give his good wishes — hardly blessing, I would think — to a massive gathering of French Young Christian Workers whose members were there, on the admission of one of their leaders, primarily as members of the working class and only secondarily as Christians. There have been other examples in recent years at all levels of the Church's clerical establishment and the impression is not calculated to encourage where anti-Communism is concerned. Most startling of all, perhaps, was the stance adopted at Havana in Cuba in an off-the-record conversation with journalists by Archbishop Casaroli, Pope Paul's Ambassador-at-Large. Ilio Gioffredi, Havana correspondent of *l'Unita*, organ of the Italian Communist Party, wrote in its issue of April 6th, 1974: "Monsignor Casaroli, speaking off the record to a group of journalists, said that he saw no contradiction between the teaching of Marxism as a means of social education, or scientific discipline, of critical spirit, and the teaching of religion, as spiritual education and the possibility of optional choice". Archbishop Casaroli reportedly added, "in the social sphere the Christian doctrine has many common aspects with the social divisions of Marxism and other progressive movements, which ought to allow the formation between them of solid and organic links in many domains". In comment on these words, Herve Leclerc wrote: "These statements, which many Catholics found hard to believe and which aroused controversy in Rome, were neither denied nor modified, even after the return from Cuba of Monsignor Casaroli, who is Secretary to the Council of Public Affairs of the Church. It must therefore be supposed that they represent the last word in the new relations between the Church of Pope Paul VI and Marxism"

(1). Leclerc goes on to add by way of comment: "It is now reported that the Pope, whose health has been troubling him and who is unsure how much longer he will be in active charge, wishes to make more rapid progress and create an irreversible situation of understanding with the 'socialist' countries".

Italy's Marxist Worker-Priests

The question, of course, is whether the understanding Leclerc speaks of is sought on pragmatic or ideological grounds. His use of the word "irreversible" would seem to indicate that, in his own view, the approach of the Church to Communist Power is motivated by more than pragmatic considerations. This is certainly true of the lower clergy. Take this report from a meeting two years ago at Modena, in Italy, which was printed in the American Catholic paper, *The Wanderer*:

The Bishop of Gubbio, Most Rev. Pagani, appearing in this north-central Italian city to deliver an address was greeted by a sea of clenched fists, a verse of the *Internationale*, and a lively chorus of protest. The Marxists were priests, approximately half of the 300 so-called "worker-priests" in the country.

The movement which flourished in France after the Second World War and which was condemned by the Holy Office in the mid-1950's, has taken on new life in Italy during the past decade. The men combine the duties of an industrial worker with priestly duties. Curial censorship is said to have been due to the fact that the arrangement caused priests to become practising Communists, rather than workers to become practising Catholics. Apparently the censorship has been waived by today's hierarchy.

Chanting the slogan "Church, yes! Episcopal politics, no!" it is rather the worker-priests who stand in judgment on their bishops. Refusing to take part in any workmen's events or pilgrimages of the Holy Year,

(1) Cf. *Marxism and the Church of Rome*, published by The Institute for the Study of Conflict, 17 Northumberland Avenue, London WC2N 5BJ at £1.00. This rewarding study does not tell the whole story, neither does it claim to do so; but it is highly recommended. I have drawn on it for these articles.

the group called the Jubilee theme of reconciliation, a "mystifying" attempt to do away with the class struggle. In a final document formulated at the Modena convention, their third annual general meeting, the group denounced the "anti-labour uses" to which the Gospel was being put and which resulted in the pretence that the cultural patterns proclaimed in the Bible are those of the dominating classes. "We worker-priests", the document stated, "are committed to a precise, concrete and historical human promotion, seeking all forms of conscience-raising, participation, socialization, and politicalization which gives first place to man free of all the oppressions which the capitalistic society imposes".

The visit of Bishop Pagni to the convention was considered to be a conciliatory gesture on the part of the Italian Episcopal Conference in an effort to reach what they call "an organic relationship through a clarifying encounter". Perhaps due to the recent anti-Marxist declaration of the Episcopal Conference, worker-priests concluded their convention more determined than ever to refuse such an encounter. Said their spokesman, Father Siri Politi: "We are not outside the Church. The visit of Bishop Pagni proved that we are a reality which the bishops cannot ignore".

One could add to the Italian worker-priests, the Third-World Priests of the Argentine, those of *Echange et Dialogue* in France — even though this organization has now been dissolved by its members who, at one time, numbered 800 — many others in Spain, in Latin America, in the United States, and so on.

Anti-Anti-Communists

Where the higher ranks of the clergy are concerned, I would not suggest that any of them are actively pro-Communist, though I would not be surprised to discover that some of them were. What I would say is that, for reasons which we shall explore later on, a by no means insignificant number of them are anti-anti-Communist; and, of these, I believe some, without knowing it, are most certainly used, at

several removes, in the long-term interests of Communist design which is, of course, to encourage and take advantage of the present weakness and confusion in the Church from within, with a view to its eventual disintegration. I would suggest, against this brief background, that there is an ideological factor influencing the present stance of the Church with regard to Communism — in the shape, as we shall see, of a pronounced change in her attitude to the secular — to men at work in the world — which has not merely blunted the edge of her opposition to Communism, but led her to believe that there is now common ground, where there was none before, which Christians can share with Communists.

A Whiff of Masonry

(This may be the place to add in parenthesis that, though I have no evidence of priests or prelates who are active members of the Communist Party and positively support its aims, some reasonably firm evidence is appearing to the effect that a tiny handful of highly placed prelates in the Church may have Masonic connections and be presumed, in consequence, to be working, consciously or subconsciously, for its destruction. For several years now I have thought this not unlikely. Evidence has since come that appears to point in this direction. There is no reason why anyone should be surprised. This kind of thing has happened before in history. In the reign of the first Elizabeth, Sir Francis Walsingham had a curial Cardinal in his pay; and there have been other instances. All I would say here is that any stoking up within the Church by a Masonic or, indeed, progressive prelate of the fires of auto-destruction — say, through an uprooted, destabilized and “on-going” liturgy — would spread the type of dismay, disorientation and despair amongst the Faithful which would suit the Communist book most admirably.)

Communism not Condemned by Vatican II

Perhaps the best example of the Church's change of attitude with regard to Communism is to be found in that very peculiar incident which took place at the Second Vatican Council itself and which could well serve as a watershed

between the old attitude and the new; the point at which it became manifest for all to see that the Church's ideological stance with regard to Communism had changed. I refer to the attempt made at the Council to get Communism condemned. It failed. The more one reflects on it, the more extraordinary the failure itself — quite apart from its attendant circumstances — becomes. That it should have been necessary for a group of Council Fathers to have to try to get Communism condemned is in itself almost unbelievable. Just consider the setting for a moment. Here was the Church in full array, so to say. Here were its leaders — Cardinals, Patriarchs, Bishops, Heads of Religious Orders gathered round the Holy Father himself — solemnly assembled in Ecumenical Council, the twenty-first in the history of the Church. And confronting them was the most highly systematized, most widespread and most fast-spreading system of evil that the world, perhaps, has ever known. Rooted in denial of God, Communism's degradation of man was complete. In token of that degradation it had butchered millions of innocent human beings and consigned millions more to slavery. Its hatred of religion was total; its persecution of Christianity in all its forms wherever it came to power relentless. And here was the Church in full panoply of Ecumenical Council, the prime enemy of Communism, as it had to be, because God was the reason for its existence, whereas God's denial lay at the core of the Communist creed. Yet, at that Council, no direct and official word of condemnation was spoken against the worst evil, perhaps, that has ever confronted mankind in the whole of its history. All that Communism got at the Council was a reference by implication in a footnote to the document on Atheism. That and nothing more. It is as if the British Parliament, considering the situation of the United Kingdom in the late summer of 1939, made no mention whatsoever in a long three-day debate of Hitler and his Nazis. The omission at the Council, when you come to think of it, is almost incredible.

Russian Orthodox Observers at Vatican II

So, too, is the story of the defeat of the attempt at the Council to secure a public condemnation of Communism. It needs to be told as an aid to getting at the mentality

responsible for it and responsible also, I believe, for the Church's seeming conversion from implacable foe of Communism to the role of neutral observer and, at times and in some places, would be co-operator and faltering ally. One has to begin a little way back. Pope John, ever anxious to melt the Communist ice, made it a matter of the highest priority that observers from the Russian Orthodox Church should attend the Council and the then Monsignor Willebrands, now Cardinal Archbishop of Utrecht, secured something of a triumph when, at the last minute and contrary to everyone's expectations, two Orthodox observers did, in fact, arrive not long after negotiations in Paris and Moscow. There are two things, I think, that need to be said right away about this invitation and its acceptance. The first is that it does betray a certain naivete, coupled with wishful thinking, on the part, presumably, of Pope John, who issued it. The reason is that the Russian Orthodox Church in its higher administration is the creature of the Soviet State. In his letter to Patriarch Pimen, the Head of that Church, Solzhenitsyn asked perfectly correctly what could be said in favour of "a Church administration that is at the mercy of atheistic dictators appointed to control it by the Department of Religious Affairs". What indeed? Why then issue the invitation to those who would come to the Council only to turn it as best they could to the service of the Soviet State? One can only assume that Pope John was ignorant of the servitude to which the Russian Orthodox Church had been reduced by the Soviet State, which seems almost incredible; or that he was taken up with the thought that the love of God, which burnt so bright within him, would achieve a miracle. At this point one can only maintain a respectful silence. In the event, it would seem that Moscow got what it wanted in exchange for the presence of the two Orthodox observers at the Council. Peter Nichols, Rome correspondent of the *Times*, claimed that, during Monsignor Willebrands' visit to Moscow to secure their presence, assurances were given that the Council would not "breathe a spirit of anti-Communism". Henri Fesquet of *Le Monde* has claimed that the price paid for their attendance was that the Fathers would not condemn Communism. Monsignor Willebrands has said that the only promise he made was "that the problem was treated positively in the Council programme". In any event, the

presence of the two Orthodox observers was certainly inhibiting where any condemnation of Communism was concerned and, during the Council's early stages, whilst Pope John was alive, it would appear that any formal condemnation of Communism was more or less impossible. According to a report in the *Tablet*, at the end of the Second Session, Pope Paul was considering "a schema on Communism, which is the most active and formidable of the heresies of the twentieth century. Pope John took strong steps to prevent anti-Communist speeches which might have prevented the coming of Orthodox observers".

The Rhine Group and Communism

Why, then, was there no schema on Communism after Pope John's death? This is the question we have to answer. There were certainly demands for it. One came from Cardinal Wyszynski, the Primate of Poland. During the Second Session of the Council, with Pope John now gone to his reward and Pope Paul in charge, 200 Council Fathers from 46 countries demanded a clear refutation of the errors of Marxism. They made little progress and the reason for this, it seems clear, was the opposition to any kind of condemnation of Communism which came from the Rhine Group of Council Fathers and their advisers whose able and ruthless manoeuvring in the earliest stages of the Council had placed their men in control of its Commissions and at the nerve-centres of its life. There can be no doubt whatsoever about this. The story has been told with edifying objectivity by an excellent priest-journalist, Father Ralph M. Wiltgen, SVD, in his book, *The Rhine Flows into the Tiber*, which is now unfortunately out of print, so far as I know. In his book, Father Wiltgen shows very clearly that the Rhine Group of Council Fathers — from Germany, Holland, Belgium, France and Austria, with other allies — were opposed to any new condemnation of Communism and worked very hard to prevent it. By the time the Fourth Session of the Council came around what came to be known as the International Group of Fathers — formed to counteract the neo-modernist tendencies of the Rhine Group and led by Archbishop Lefebvre, Archbishop Sigaud and Bishop de Castro Mayer — drew up a petition giving ten reasons why Communism should

be condemned and warned that if the Council remained silent on Communism it would be "equivalent to disavowing all that has been said and done up till now". The group also warned that, unless there was a condemnation, "tomorrow the Council will be reproved — and justly so — for its silence on Communism which will be taken as a sign of cowardice and conniving". Strong support was given to this petition and 450 Council Fathers signed written interventions asking for Communism to be treated specifically in the schema of the Constitution on the Church in the Modern World which was due for revision.

On November 13th, 1965, the Commission responsible for this schema distributed a revised version which, contrary to the rules of the Council, contained no mention of the 450 interventions and no mention of Communism. Bishop Carli sent an official protest to the Council Presidency quoting the Rules of Procedure which stated that "all amendments must be printed and communicated to the Council Fathers so that they can decide by vote whether they wish to admit or reject each one". He pointed out quite correctly that if the Commissions — all of which were controlled by the Rhine Group — decided what the Council Fathers could and could not be allowed to vote on, then they, rather than the Fathers, would in fact constitute the Council. Cardinal Tisserant was given the responsibility of conducting an official investigation. The first excuse given by the Commission responsible for the schema was that the interventions had not been handed in within the prescribed time limit. "I can confirm the fact that the amendment on Communism did not reach either the members of the Commission or us *periti* who are part of the Commission", explained one *peritus* who added, "There is no intrigue of any sort . . ." This placed the blame on the International Group of Fathers for failing to deliver the interventions in time. This move, however, had been foreseen by Archbishop Lefebvre who, with Archbishop Sigaud, had delivered the interventions in person at noon on October 9th, 1965; i.e. *within* the prescribed time limit. Thus the blame was back on the Commission where it belonged. Eventually, Archbishop (now Cardinal) Garonne of Toulouse had to apologise and to admit that the interventions on Communism had "indeed reached the offices of our Commission within the proper time, but were not examined

when they should have been, because unintentionally they had not been transmitted to the Commission members". Both Father Wiltgen and the well-known French writer, Bernard Ray, specifically name Mgr. Achille Glorieux of Lille as the man directly responsible for holding back the interventions. He was never disciplined for this deceit, but appointed Nuncio and is, at present, I am told, in occupation of that post in Cairo.

Apertura al Sinistra

Thus there was no condemnation of the most hideous tyranny of our times. It was too late for the text of the schema to be changed in the Council Hall, but the Pope himself intervened to make the relevant section (Article 21) read in its final version: "The Church has already repudiated and cannot cease repudiating, sorrowfully but as firmly as possible, those poisonous doctrines and actions which contradict reason and the common experience of humanity, and dethrone man from his native excellence". A footnote refers to papal encyclicals condemning Communism and thus it could be argued that Communism is, indeed, condemned in the *Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*, if only indirectly. The fact remains, however, that the Council, through the intransigence and, indeed, the trickery of the Rhine Group of Fathers, was forced to abstain from any explicit condemnation of Communism and that there was created, thereby, that *apertura al sinistra* or opening to the Left, which has widened steadily from that day until this, when Communists in Italy stood poised, only a few months ago, to take with their votes the national government of Italy and succeeded in taking municipal control of Rome itself. So far has the policy of the Rhine Group of Fathers, first evidenced at the Council and proceeded with ever since, got the Church. We have to ask in succeeding articles how it could ever come about that clerics so high in the service of the Church could *think* in this fashion. What built the attitude that turned them, in the space of a generation, from implacable foes of Communism to its would-be, faltering allies? There is a history to this which we need to explore.

(To be Continued)

The Author of this article, a Dublin professional man, speaks for many in this balanced and perceptive piece of writing. It is remarkable that in this supposed age of communication, voices such as his remain deliberately (as it would appear) unheard by Authority within the Church.

Ad Maiorem Dei Gloriam

NIALL MONTGOMERY

THIS valley of tears has had its fill of mourning and weeping since 1900 but, oddly enough, there have been very few surprises. In the perspective of history, the horrors of the twentieth century are remarkable more for scope and intensity than for novelty — there's nothing new about inhumanity, genocide, torture and tyranny. Even the moonwalk — among the relatively benignant events — was predictable, given the modern neglect of the humanities for the schoolboy world of science, and, of course, the pleasantest thing about that was not that man walked on the moon, but that he forgot to bring back with him his £3,000 camera!

Catastrophe

But there has been one surprise — at least for certain men who went to a certain kind of school in the twenties, where they studied, *inter alia*, Religious Knowledge each day for at least one hour of the six-day week, and where they were taught to regard as the immutable centre of their religion the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. People of that generation understood the Mass and, as they grew older, without thinking about it, without being particularly "religious", took it so much for granted that, when it was suspended, they simply didn't know what had happened — and still don't. As children, they would have been given the

impression (a) that the new Moscow-centered Communist regime would sooner or later destroy itself from within and b) that the gates of hell would not prevail against the Church of Rome. It is going too far to say that that prophecy has been fulfilled antipodally. At least impression (a) has faded; impression (b), *hoffentlich*, remains. Nobody denies that there is catastrophe, however; not everyone sees it as catastrophe. But that's what it is.

What Crisis Caused It?

It is astonishing not only that catastrophe should have occurred in the Church, but that it has been wrought by reverend and respected men who, as young priests, unambiguously and sternly preached immutability and stressed it as a mark of universality, catholicity and eternal durability. Maybe that is the essence of the astonishment — that the fixity, firmness and immutability of doctrine and liturgy; qualities that, to the ordinary man, were guarantees of the reality of religion, were illusory. Clearly what was taught was wrong. Clearly, also, the teachers were unconscious of error, for, had they been secretly aware of it, they would have been involved in playing a joke on the laity, and that's not acceptable, even in the wide context of to-day's astonishment. Granted, then, that the old teaching was wrong, the reformers' zeal is understandable: even so, their lack of self-consciousness is remarkable. The Catholic layman is mute — his silence is a mark of obedience, based on trust in the Church: there is an assumption that the Church will not betray that trust. There were no laymen at the second Vatican Council — was there a mandate from the "people of God", to use the phrase so frequently on Oliver Cromwell's lips, to suspend the Mass? Or was it, perhaps, a palace revolution? One may, of course, cite in support of the change its silent acceptance by the laity, but is that a true interpretation of that climate of immemorial silence? The Protestant synodsmen is an articulate member of the Church he has to govern. Traditionally mute, lacking the apparatus of assent or dissent, the Catholic — not "programmed" for crisis — is helpless when it hits him. What was the crisis that caused the catastrophe? Populations grow beyond the point of support afforded by the social and economic structures.

Injustice, inequality, starvation prevail: the problem intensifies in direct ratio to size. That is the turning-point. Men accuse the social system and conventions that connive at injustice; some go further, join the Church as defendants. People look for new ideals. Many people, many Catholics — and not only in Italy — are fascinated by the Communist ideal, promoter of the greatest good for the greatest number. They tend to discount reports of the failure of the ideal in practice; given the chance, they would show how benevolent the system could be. Conscious of the movement, people in the Church, not only laymen, but also distinguished and influential prelates, perhaps thought to save the day by showing that Catholicism was not inferior to Communism in matters of compassion and of the brotherhood of man.

That is true, in a certain perspective, but it is a case in which the perspective is, for a Christian, crucial — and the pun is intentional. *Nos autem gloriari oportet in cruce Domini nostri Jesu Christi*. Under Communism, love of one's neighbour is an aspect of one's devotion to the State, and hence that "love" is best enclosed in inverted commas; it is too, an aspect of the belief in an earthly paradise. A Christian loving his neighbour, however, thus manifests his love of God and his belief in an extra-terrestrial dominion. The other adjustment in perspective is that, for most Christians, for Catholics certainly, the State has its equivalent in spiritual matters in the Church.

Catholicism's Special Identity

The Roman Catholic Church has a special identity, a special dignity, special powers and responsibilities. That identity, those powers and those responsibilities are, in one sense, accidents — but they are not disposable possessions. Many old-fashioned Catholics will have been distressed, for instance, by a rumour, at the beginning of the present Pope's pontificate, that he contemplated selling the triple crown and giving the proceeds to the poor. It simply wasn't his to sell! Even in secular matters, it's not good when a potentate for whatever reason, discards his identity and divests himself of duties, powers and dignities which are accidents of his office rather than of his person. It was good neither for

England nor for the King when Edward VIII resigned, and, in the world of legend, it was bad when King Lear, for "love" too, divided his kingdom between two daughters who despised him and disinherited the daughter who loved him. Today there are many disinherited Catholics baffled by the Vatican's dividing up of the house of God between people whose devotion to their Heavenly Father is subsumed, to say the least of it, in concern for the community. Was the institution of a people's religion necessary as a tactic in the war against Communism? There's a good saying: "Never fight a man with his own weapons!" But is there a fight against Communism? The Pope, certainly, is against it — is the Church? — and overall, there is a difficulty in coordinating — separating? — the spiritual and temporal governments. But what's at issue, of course, is not just the institution of a people's religion — it's its substitution for a divine religion. Was that necessary?

Trap and Double Trap

There are in their sixties and seventies men who still go to church on Sundays but know in their hearts and souls that they haven't been to Mass for over a decade. They know, too, that, certainly, the Mass will be said again some day, but that, by then, they will have been cremated after a half-improvised "service" in the vernacular. If Latin was the obstacle, if *Non intres in iudicium cum servo tuo, Domine* was a barrier, then, surely, the time had come to rehabilitate the devout, plain men of the seventeenth century and to say:

Man that is born of a woman is of few days, and full of trouble. He cometh forth like a flower and is cut down.

But Latin was not the obstacle. That was the trap! Unfortunately, many characters have fallen into that trap, discredited themselves and prejudiced their longing for resumption of the Mass by appearing to seek the restitution of the Latin ceremony. And that's a double trap! One falls into the other part of the snare by apologising for the Church's use of Latin. That's nonsense! Critics who say that the splendour of the *Exsultet*, for instance — the words, the chant, its place in the Liturgy — is for aesthetes only, pretend

not to know that the splendour is God's. None of that needs to be explained to men, who, as schoolboys, superscribed their exercises "A.M.D.G.". One of the glories of the Church is that it moulded European art and literature; at certain levels, the history of European civilisation is the history of a culture dominated by Catholicism. But, of course, that's why it had to go! This time the "bise" isn't just tramontane, it's an icy blast from the Steppes. The "ingenuous" explanation of the change is that the Church dissociates itself from the Capitalist system. Certainly Capitalism doesn't make everybody happy. Does Communism? The fact seems to be that, to compete with Communism, a civilisation created under the auspices of the Church for the greater glory of God is rejected. Strategically the rejection has been a master-move — it is the diversion that allows the basic changes to be carried out almost unobserved. The changes in the forms distracted those who approved and those who disapproved alike from seeing what was really happening — the changes in the substance. How was that achieved? It's worth analysing. The methods are summed up in the Confiteor:

cogitatione, verbo et opere
and the Novus Ordo, pertinently adds:
omissione.

The Motive for the Change

It's not for the laity to know the mind of the Church, but now, it's perhaps, permissible, without irreverence, to try from observation of the sixteen-year old scene, to deduce the motive for the change. Was the idea to bring the Church nearer to the people? That was, perhaps, the object of reducing the solemnity of the Mass and the mediatory office of the celebrant. Was there a feeling that the mystical aspects of religion are no longer *de mise*? Hence, perhaps, a relaxation in the homage to the Blessed Sacrament and less stress, for instance, on Benediction. Indeed, in its new style, the Mass involves the people to such an extent that the priest is rather a witness than a celebrant. In the Canon, the lessened importance of the celebrant is emphasised by the recruitment of a plurality of priests in the concelebrated Mass. These are details but there is a larger perspective. Is there not a fallacy in positing a polarity between God and his

people and in the consequent belief that to move towards the people one must move away from God? Surely God and His people are one? If anyone must move away from God, it's not the Church. Everything changes when the thought changes. The substance of the ritual is affected and so the transfer from Latin to English is not a mechanical process. The old meaning doesn't always travel (cf. the Gloria, the Credo and the Prefaces). If the substance changes, the expression changes; there will be new words to express the new austerity. The English of the Novus Ordo, however, is not the modern equivalent of the strong, plain and handsome language of the Book of Common Prayer. It's "common", certainly, but in a different sense. Where precision and devotion are the desiderata, the New Reformation opts, successfully, for Schwärmerei. That's painfully noticeable in the prayers from *Suscipe, sancte, Pater* onwards. It's sometimes argued that devotion is prejudiced by appreciation of fine language. But good language is nearly always plain — *pace* Sir Thomas Browne — and Saint Paul says that

Seeing then that we have such hope, we use
great plainness of speech (II Cor. 3.11)

(though Saint Paul, indeed, didn't always preach what he preached!) It's common in the Civil Service for officials to rewrite reports submitted by their juniors, mainly as exercise of privilege, without regard to the quality of the draft. The mind and the method of the men who rewrote *Te igitur, Unde et memores*, etc., will not have been dissimilar. One has the feeling that young experts, unfamiliar with the text of the Mass, were employed, but that they were nonetheless confident of their ability to improve it. (Were they Catholics?). Submit to such a team a novel by Jane Austen, for instance, and, in no time at all, you will have *Sense and Sensibility* as it might have been written by Ruby M. Ayres.

Adaptation has Failed

There was a story told of a parish priest accosted by a terrible beggarman who, when repulsed, mumbled

— *Sacerdos sum* —

Taking advantage of the astonishment thus caused he added

— *I can say Te igitur.*

and then moved to the attack with

— Can you say *Te igitur*?

The story is sad and funny too. Did the beggar receive alms? That wasn't the point — it was that, in his confusion, the parish priest couldn't remember a prayer he said every morning of his life. There's a simple story, but like the allusion to "the last Gospel" in Mr. Joyce's *Dubliners*, it's meaningless now without a "learned" commentary. So changes in the words of the Liturgy affect not only the Church and its members: on a larger plane, they alter the whole course and style of western culture.

In fact, the changes wrought by the new thought are such that, in practical terms, they are best satisfied by starting all over again. Attempts to adapt churches to suit the new religion, for instance by removal of statues, paintings and inscriptions and by relocation of the altar, have failed: they are disproportionately expensive and they destroy the devotional character of the churches without providing the sort of *Schauspielhaus* environment that the new cult demands. Priests don't talk to the laity about these things: one middle-aged man was overheard to say that for him it is crucifixion to sit with his back to the tabernacle. If the authorities were, in fact, to build anew and to abandon the existing fabrics, what would happen? Obviously, the churches would continue to be used for their original purpose, the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. At the practical level, one of the basic changes difficult to understand is the abandonment of the seasonal sequence of Masses, and of the Propers appropriate thereto. It's hard to know what was wrong, for instance, with the Corpus Christi Mass. The Introit, the Collect, familiar from years of Benediction in the school chapel, the Epistle, Gradual, well known as a Grace, the great Sequence, the Gospel, the Offertory, the Secret, the beautiful Preface and the Communions — all the elements in that Mass are appropriate and moving to devotion. The notion that one could improve on them is silly, to say the least of it.

Confusion and Concelebration

But, of course, in the realm of *opere* — one almost says *opera* — concelebration, in the cause of community worship,

is the most powerful engine in the destruction of the Mass. Philosophers analysing the sources of laughter have discovered what has for centuries been part of the professional knowledge of a range of great writers, like Moliere, and of common music-hall comedians alike, namely that the most effective way to ridicule an essentially solitary action is to arrange for its simultaneous performance by a multitude of actors. Most people, however, are moved not to laughter but to distress by the contrast, at the moment of consecration, between the behaviour of "liberated" priests and the embarrassed dignity of their elders. One is left with the impression of many priests, but no celebrant. There are other minor aspects of the new practice difficult to appreciate. The freedom given to priests to improvise in their reading of the Liturgy is, again, the sort of Brechtian concept that one associates rather with the People's Theatre than with the House of God. Granted acceptance of the principle, there is still the danger of disedification when prayers are improvised by priests unendowed with inspiration or talent. On some of the new practices, polite, calm comment is not possible — e.g. Communion in the hand. Finally, in the world of deeds, it is hard to see how God is served by congregations of hatless, bare-armed women and dirty, unshaven men, all in jeans, specially rolled in mud for the occasion. But, to move to the sphere of omissions, how can one expect the congregation to dress properly when the priest appears on the High Altar without biretta? Who can forget that at High Mass, the celebrant, deacon and subdeacon, on notice from the Master of Ceremonies, removed their birettas and bowed their heads in homage to the Holy Name. Why was that wrong and why to-day is the Holy Name no longer honoured even by bowing the head? The words and forms symbolic of reverence for the Blessed Trinity, too, for instance, have disappeared. The Kyrie Eleison is truncated, the bell rings once only at the Elevation and the *Placeat tibi* has gone. Is belief in the Trinity no longer a mark of Catholicism, or is it what is patronisingly called a "pious belief"?

The Silent Celebrant is Missed

Obviously, of course, the erosion of the Proper has been an important factor in the devaluing of the Mass and in the

creation of gloom and despondency amongst the Mass-going peoples. The silence of the church during Mass was good. It created a reverent tension, a special consciousness of the Mystery; it made the climate for recollection, meditation and prayer. It ensured participation of the Faithful in the Mass as to-day's noisy pantomime will never do.

One misses the silent celebrant. After half a century, one recalls with respect and uncomprehending affection the bleak Fathers with the winged soutanes who presided over one's boyhood. One can never associate those smooth, grave faces with black glasses, berets, curly beards, bare chests and aerolite rifles. The dirty old beggarman mumbling *Sacerdos sum* is a more real character than the terrifying advocates of Helder Camara's "violence of Christ".

"Until recent years, no one was permitted to touch the sacred vessels and still less the consecrated Host, except a priest or deacon. Linen which had been in immediate contact with host or chalice had to be washed by a priest or cleric before being sent to the laundry. When the Blessed Sacrament was exposed we were trained to make a 'double-genuflection', that is, to go down on both knees and bow the shoulders. These directions, and there were others, inculcated a sense of deep reverence for the Real Presence. One cannot but deplore the ruthless manner in which they have been brushed aside. . . .

"It is high time we rid ourselves of the brazen tendency to treat God, in whose sight the very angels are not pure, almost as an equal; as an accomodating fellow-traveller who is just one of ourselves.

" 'One of ourselves', certainly. But with all the emphasis we command, let it be stated that to 'treat Him as 'just' one of ourselves is insufferable arrogance." — Father Robert Nash, S.J.

In this third article, W. H. Marshner deals with the true infallibility of the whole Church and attempts being made at present by progressives to twist this doctrine to the detriment of Papal Authority.

Acknowledgements to *The Wanderer*.

Notes on *Mysterium Ecclesiae*

3: INFALLIBILITY OF THE WHOLE CHURCH

W. H. MARSHNER

CHAPTERS 2, 3, and 4 of *Mysterium Ecclesiae* form a unit devoted to the subjects exercising the gift of infallibility: first of all, the whole Church; secondly, the college of bishops scattered throughout the world but teaching everywhere the same doctrine (ordinary magisterium); thirdly, the college of bishops assembled under the presidency of the Pope in an Ecumenical Council; and finally, the Pope alone speaking *ex cathedra*. In the course of this discussion, important issues regarding the nature and extent of infallibility are raised and answered.

Entitled "The Infallibility of the Universal Church," Chapter 2 deals with a matter which has seen of late some bizarre applications. Among theological progressives the fact that the whole Church is a subject of infallibility is used to promote a sort of "New Federalism" vis-a-vis Roman authority. Power allegedly "centralized" in Rome over the centuries is now supposed to flow back to the national conferences, the dioceses and even (why not?) the parish councils. This blurred and diffused infallibility of all is then exalted as the basic "reality" of which the Pope's own infallibility is only an (emergency) expression — an expression, obviously, which becomes meaningless and impossible without the accompanying "consent" of the whole Church. This the progressives say in the teeth of Vatican I, by the way, which insisted that the Pope's infallible teachings

are irreformable "of themselves" and not because of the consent of the Church.

Meanwhile, in certain "right-wing" circles, the infallibility of the whole Church is interpreted as some kind of emergency infallibility of the laity. Reference is made to the role of the faithful in the Arian controversy, with the not-too-subtle suggestion that episcopal apostasy on an enormous scale is with us again. How do we know? Well, because the bishops have accepted the *New Ordo*, or sex education, or whatever, whereas the infallible laity are supposed to be standing firm. Now in point of fact, it may be true (at least I believe it is true) that a small segment of the laity has shown considerably better sense than a hefty proportion of the bishops in recent years on a wide variety of issues. But this latter point, be it true or false, has virtually nothing to do with the true infallibility of the universal Church. So what *Mysterium Ecclesiae* has to say may come as a corrective to quite a few people.

The Purpose of Infallibility

The starting point for a fruitful examination of infallibility is the purpose which this gift is supposed to serve in salvation history. Tell me the purpose of a thing, and I will tell you what design it must have in order to meet that purpose. Therefore, *Mysterium Ecclesiae* begins its discussion of infallibility with the statement that God, in His goodness "has seen to it that what He had revealed for the salvation of all nations would abide perpetually in its full integrity", a quotation from the Vatican II Constitution on Divine Revelation, section 7. Now an historical purpose, if set by God, must have an historical achievement. Thus according to Catholic doctrine, infallibility is not an empty word nor an abstract notion whose specification is left to the whims of theological dialecticians; it is an historical reality. No theory of infallibility can be true if the historical facts are against it.

Furthermore, the particular historical reality of infallibility exists to ensure a "perpetuity"; to ensure that what God revealed at the outset remains clear, available, current among men until the end of time. The *Dogmatic Constitution on The Church (Lumen Gentium)*, elaborates a three-fold task of the People of God vis-a-vis revelation, when

it says that this People "clings without fail to the Faith once delivered to the saints, penetrates it more deeply by accurate insights, and applies it more thoroughly to life". The Church's gift of infallibility has a role to play, without doubt, in each one of these tasks; but the task of "clinging", listed first by the Council fathers, enjoys a certain primacy. It is a great and a fine thing when the whole Church can advance in the understanding of the faith, but it is not very common. It is a great and fine thing when the whole Church can see clearly how to live the Gospel more faithfully, more forcefully, and more appositely, given the challenges of the times; but more often, counsels are divided; the way is dark. One thing, however, the Church must do, not now and again but every day, not more-or-less well but invariably perfectly. And that is to "keep" the Faith. Infallibility, therefore, exists primarily to help the Church to "cling" and secondarily to help her "penetrate" and "apply".

Infallibility and Unity

Mysterium Ecclesiae goes on to say that this infallibility "is present when the whole People of God unhesitatingly holds a point of doctrine pertaining to these matters" (faith and morals). Quoting St. Augustine and Vatican II, the document makes this point still clearer by saying that the People of God "manifests this unerring quality when, 'from the bishops down to the last member of the laity' (Augustine, *De Praed. Sanct.* 14,27), it shown universal agreement in matters of faith and morals". From these statements one thing should be quite clear: the infallibility of the whole Church cannot be invoked by the laity in their quarrels with the bishops but only in their concurrence with them. Put it another way: the Pope under certain circumstances is infallible independently — independently of his brother bishops and of everybody else; but there is no parallel infallibility of the laity (nor of theologians!), taken independently of the bishops, under any circumstances.

To be sure, it can happen (it probably has happened) that the bishop of a given diocese is a heretic, while his laity are sound to the last man. But that situation would not arise because the laity as such have the gift of infallibility in some emergency circumstances. No, it would arise because the

laity of that diocese agree with the other bishops of the Catholic world (especially the Pope).

To nail this point down beyond any doubt, *Mysterium Ecclesiae* states that "the Holy Spirit enlightens and assists the People of God inasmuch as it is the Body of Christ united in a hierarchical Communion" (emphasis added) and that "it is the exclusive task of these pastors alone, the successors of Peter and the other Apostles, to teach the Faith authentically, that is, with the authority of Christ shared in different ways."

From this necessity that the laity be united with their bishops in order to participate in the Church's infallibility and from the exclusivity of the bishops' prerogative as teachers, two consequences follow. First, the people "may not simply listen to them (the bishops) as experts in Catholic doctrine" but "must accept their teaching given in Christ's name, with an assent that is proportionate to the authority that they possess and that they mean to exercise". In other words, the bishops and the Pope are not mitred theologians; their authority to teach comes from Christ through the graces of their office, not from human learning or expertise. Therefore, assent and not the polite deference or suspended judgement which we accord to academic opinions, pending final proof.

Ratification not the Magisterium's Purpose

Secondly, the teaching office of the Sacred Magisterium cannot be "reduced merely to ratifying the assent already expressed" by the Faithful; "indeed, in the interpretation and explanation of the written or transmitted Word of God, the Magisterium can anticipate or demand their assent". Here the new Vatican document is paraphrasing and recondemning the 6th proposition condemned in *Lamentabili* in 1907: "In defining truths the learning Church and the teaching Church collaborate in such a way that the teaching Church has nothing to do but to ratify the consensus of the learning Church".

No comment is necessary, I should think, on the degree to which this error is being revived today. Whenever a biblical critic or a theologian says that a dogmatic question is "open" or should be "reopened" because (a) the experts have come

across new data previously unavailable to the Magisterium or (b) the Church's present or past teaching is not well founded in the Sources of Revelation or (c) the present or past teaching has not met with universal approval among the People of God — whenever such assertions are made, the real nature of the Magisterium is being perverted. Pius X recognized this error in *Lamentabili* as a key portion of the baggage of Modernism; and 37 years earlier Cardinal Manning had recognized the same error in the pretensions of Ignaz Doellinger. Today from Hans Kueng (a new Doellinger) to Raymond Brown (a new, though inelegant, Loisy) the same erroneous presumption dominates theology: the presumption that "scholars" know the truths of the Faith better than popes and bishops.

In summary, there is an infallibility of the whole Church or People of God in matters of faith and morals; but the terms "Church" and "People of God", as used in this context, must be understood as including the Pope and the bishops, never as prescinding from them. If this doctrine tells against certain careless expressions used by "conservatives", it is even more destructive of certain prevalent "liberal" ideas. In fact, it is hugely ironic that the Kueng-types, in their agitation against papal infallibility, should have picked up this weapon of ecclesial infallibility. For while the latter doctrine in no way damages papal prerogatives, it completely undercuts a major theological project of the "liberals" themselves. As we noted above in the notes on Chapter I of *Mysterium Ecclesiae*, Kueng and his cohorts are always looking for ways to broaden the definition of "the Church" so as to include non-Catholics of one description or another (schismatics, material heretics, "anonymous Christians," etc.) But it must be as obvious as sunshine that the Church as a whole cannot both be infallible and include non-Catholics! For if the Lutherans are part of the Church, and if the Church manifests her infallibility as a whole by agreeing on faith and morals, then this infallibility must have gone into mothballs around 1520. And if the Arians were somehow still part of the Church, then nothing could have been settled since 325! No, the infallibility of God's people can have no tangible, historical reality whatsoever, unless heretics and schismatics are not part of that People.

(to be continued)

Dr. Jackson makes a welcome return this month with perceptive comments on the relationship of tax-cuts to reductions in public expenditure.

Further Thoughts on the Public Sector

J. M. JACKSON

THERE has been a long term trend for the size of the public sector of the economy to grow. By 'public sector', I mean the government sector. The role of the nationalised industries may also be increasing, but since they are, for the most part, still supplying consumers through the market this is of less importance. This is not to say that there are not some drawbacks to unduly extending the range of nationalised industries. What is of critical importance is that the government sector which has to be paid for by taxing the public is increasing. In August 1975, my article on *The Growing Public Sector* pointed out that the level of current government expenditure on goods and services rose from 19 per cent of the gross national product in 1951 to 22 per cent in 1972. If various transfers are included (social security payments, debt interest and so on) are included, the total of government expenditure increased from 41 per cent of gross national product in 1951 to 49 per cent in 1972. In addition, the government is financing capital expenditure in various fields.

The extent of government spending has increased since 1972. Some estimates have put the total of government spending, current spending on goods and services, current spending on grants and debt interest and capital expenditure at as much as sixty per cent of the national product. This massive programme of government spending must impose a heavy burden of taxation upon the British public. Not all of the programme has been financed, however, by taxation. One reads frequently of the *Public Sector Borrowing*

Requirement. The government, in fact, borrows a vast sum in order to pay for its spending programme. This would not be too serious if it were able to borrow the genuine savings of its own citizens. But, as I pointed out in *Economic Survey* in August 1976, the country as a whole was spending £106 billion in 1975 out of a real income of £102 billion. We were spending £4 billion more than we produced by our own efforts. A substantial part of this overspending was met, in real terms, by running down stocks of finished goods, raw materials and work in progress. £1.7 billion was accounted for by the balance of payments deficit. In other words, we bought this much more from abroad than we paid for by our exports; we borrowed this much from foreigners.

The Latest Cuts

The budget introduced at the end of last year by the Chancellor involved further substantial reductions in government spending. These cuts were of the order of £2 billion in 1977 and £3 billion in 1978. About half of the cuts were to be in real expenditures, that is involving a reduction in the quantity of goods and services provided by the government, and about half to involve a reduction in money spending only (for example reducing food subsidies, thus putting an additional burden on the consumer).

Put in these simple terms, this is just the kind of measure that the government should be taking. There is, however, one aspect of the proposed cuts that is unsatisfactory. When one looks at them in detail, it becomes apparent that a very large proportion of the real cuts are on capital spending. This is taking the easy way out. There is no great difficulty in postponing the building of a hospital or school, or delaying the start of a new motorway. The government, by reducing capital programmes, avoids the direct clashes that would arise if it were to reduce current spending and employ fewer teachers, nurses, doctors, civil servants and so on. It concentrates the resulting unemployment on the construction industry.

There is one particularly unfortunate feature of this decision to take the easy way out and cut capital programmes. These may be held down to the proposed levels in 1977 and 1978 but they cannot necessarily be kept to these

levels over a longer period. Government spending is far too high and needs to be reduced in the long run, and this means bringing down the level of current as well as capital spending.

The Tax Burden

Although the level of government spending has involved massive borrowing, it has also necessitated an increasing burden of taxation. Something of this increase can be seen by looking at the way the starting point for income tax has been progressively lowered in real terms. In 1976, average earnings for men in industry were about £65 a week as compared with £35 in 1972. In 1972, a married man with two children earning this average wage would have paid nearly £5 in net taxation (income tax plus national insurance contributions minus family allowance). This represents about 14 per cent of his income. A man in similar circumstances earning the £65 average wage in 1976 paid £14.50 in net taxation or 22 per cent of his wage.

This is a startling figure. For a man on the average wage, which over this particular short period of four years would have increased very little in real purchasing power, the level of taxation had increased by fully one half.

It is easy to see how this comes about. The system of income taxation allows the taxpayer certain allowances free of tax and then takes 35 per cent of the remaining income (with higher rates of tax on some larger incomes). These allowances have been increased from time to time, but have never in recent years kept in line with the falling value of money. Take some hypothetical figures. In one year, a man earns £2,000 and has tax allowances of £1,000. He pays tax on £1,000 at 35 per cent. The total tax bill is thus £350. Suppose in the next year, prices increase by twenty per cent and that his income also rises by twenty per cent to £2,400. The Chancellor, however, increases his tax free allowances to £1,100, that is by 10 per cent only. If these allowances had increased to £1,200, that is by twenty per cent in line with prices, the taxpayer would pay tax at 35 per cent on £1,200, that is £420. His income after tax would have risen by exactly twenty per cent from £1,650 to £1,980 and would enable him to enjoy exactly the same standard of living as in the first

year. But if tax allowances rise by only £100, he pays tax on £1,300, which amounts to £455, leaving him a net income of £1,945. This it will be found has only the purchasing power of £1,620 in the first year. Because tax allowances have not kept pace with inflation, a man with a given real wage is paying a bigger proportion in taxation than originally.

This is exactly the kind of thing that has been happening. For the tax year, 1975/76, the personal allowance for a married man was £950. For the tax year 1976/77, it was increased by £130 to £1,085. This was an increase of 13 per cent, but this fell far short of the rate of inflation over this period. And the same thing has been happening for a very long time.

Taxation and Social Security Benefits

A great deal of publicity has been given to the question of social security benefits and the lack of adequate rewards for those who work. There are two forms of abuse of social security benefits. There are those who defraud the authorities by claiming benefits to which they are not entitled. This is simply a matter, for example, of claiming benefits whilst employed or claiming for non-existent dependents. The remedy for such abuse is, of course, to use the sanctions of the criminal law as with all other types of fraud. The other problem is that the incentive to find work is seriously reduced by the generous level of benefits provided. Whether there are many or few who are content to draw benefit rather than make a genuine effort to find work is irrelevant. It is essential that adequate benefits are provided for those genuinely unable to find employment, but there is something very wrong with a system that leaves the man who takes a job little better and perhaps worse off than when he was unemployed.

Just how true is the claim that a man may be better off on social security than working? How true is it that there is little advantage in finding a job? There are those who regard this line of criticism as an attack on the social security system as such, a dishonest propaganda exercise by right wing extremists. But the Chancellor himself has admitted that there is something wrong and that he wants room to lower the level of taxation in order to make the net reward for work more worthwhile.

It is not easy to give an exact picture of the situation. This is because the whole system of benefits has become so complex. The low paid worker may be receiving, in addition to the universal family allowances, a range of means tested benefits including Family Income Supplement, rent allowance or rebate, rates rebate, free school meals and so on. The unemployed worker may be receiving Earnings Related Benefit in addition to his flat rate Unemployment Benefit, and he may also or instead be getting Supplementary Benefit. Finally, he may receive a tax rebate, though this will depend very largely upon when he becomes unemployed. A well paid worker becoming unemployed half way through the tax year may be able to get a rebate for the rest of the year. A man paying less tax will get the rebate only for a short spell, whilst anybody becoming unemployed at the start of the tax year gets no rebate because no tax has been paid during that financial year.

We may, however, look at the position of a few typical cases. Suppose a married man with two children becomes unemployed after a period when he has been earning the average wage of £65 a week. In employment, he would pay £12.28 a week tax and £3.73 National Insurance and receive £1.50 in Family Allowance. This would leave him with take home pay of £50.49. This compares 'favourably with Unemployment Benefit, including Earnings Related Supplement, of £37.77 plus Family Allowance of £1.50, making a total of £39.27. If, however, he has paid any substantial amount of income tax, he can have this refunded at the rate of £10.50 a week until all tax has been repaid.* This means that so long as he gets both tax rebate and Earnings Related Supplement he will be getting a total of £49.77 a week. This is in fact only 72p less than his normal take home pay and family allowance. Other means tested benefits may well mean he is better off. Of course, if unemployment strikes in April, there will be no tax rebates and he will not fare so well when unemployed. In any case, the Earnings Related Supplement stops after six months, and his weekly income will drop to £29 unless he can still get a tax rebate.

If we take a man with a £40 wage, his net income when

* He pays £12.28 a week. This means that for every four weeks of the tax year that have elapsed before he becomes unemployed he will be able to receive this refund for roughly five weeks.

employed would be £36.37 whilst he would get £35.50 when drawing Unemployment Benefit plus Earnings Related Supplement. The gap here is very small, and clearly if there is a tax refund such a man is substantially better off than when employed. This kind of situation is of comparatively recent origin. If we go back to 1972, we would find that in general there was a bigger gap between a man's net income when in work and when unemployed. In 1972, an unemployed man drawing Earnings Related Supplement had 74 per cent of the net income of an employed man; in 1976 he had 78 per cent. If the same kind of relation held in 1976 as in 1972, the unemployed man would have had an income of £37.36 including Earnings Related Supplement instead of £39.27. This would have meant an additional £1.90 difference between the earnings of the man on the average wage when employed and unemployed.

The present system has reduced the net reward for working to a ridiculous extent. This is quite unacceptable. It has come about because the taxman has been taking an increasing slice from the gross earnings of the worker, especially in this period when wages have been held down by a strict incomes policy whilst social security benefits have been allowed to increase at a faster rate than wages.

No wonder that even a socialist chancellor is beginning to realise what a hash he has made of things and that it is time to start rectifying the position if the unions will let him. And what a confession of impotence to have to admit that necessary reforms of the tax system are only possible if the unions agree to an appropriate limitation of wage increases.

Incomes Policy

The continued operation of an incomes policy is an essential element in any programme for economic recovery. Inflation cannot be wholly overcome if world prices of essential raw materials and other essential imports continue to rise. If the rate of inflation is to be brought down to a reasonable level, it is essential that we avoid any internal pressure on prices. If wages rise excessively, this must be reflected in high prices. It is no use unions claiming that they need higher wages to offset rising prices. We are living beyond our means and a rise in prices is the most appropriate

mechanism for forcing us to realise this fact and to change our ways. But this mechanism cannot work if we try to offset it by raising money wages.

Any runaway increase in wages would have disastrous results. It would put up prices, and reduce our achievements in the export field. It would lead to a further speculative run on the pound, leading to a further fall in its value, a rise in the cost of imports and a further rise in home prices to cover the cost of imported raw materials.

At the same time, we must before very long allow some adjustments in wage relativities. The incomes policy operated for the last two years has led to a marked narrowing of differentials. We had one year in which increases were limited to £6 a week, with a ceiling operating at £8,000. In the second year, an increase was allowed of roughly £4, but with a minimum of £2.50 permitted and a ceiling of £4 on increases, but with no ceiling on the level of earnings to which the £4 could be added. Let us see how this affects people at different levels of earnings. The table below summarises the situation. It shows the impact of the policy on the following: the man who was getting roughly average earnings (£3,312 after Phase I is just under £64 a week compared with the average of £65); a man earning about two thirds of the average; one earning about two thirds more than the average and just about limited to the maximum increase in phase II; and a man on £8,000, the ceiling for an increase under phase I.

Initial earnings		Earnings after phase I	Earnings after phase II	
£2,000	100	£2,312	£2,432	100
£3,000	150	£3,312	£3,444	147
£5,000	250	£5,312	£5,520	227
£8,000	400	£8,000	£8,208	338

The table shows the income of these men given the increases permitted under the last and the present phases of the government's income policy. It also shows for the initial situation and the situation after phase II in relative terms, each man's earnings being shown as a percentage of those of the lowest pay level considered. The percentage figures for the situation after phase II show how the policy has affected

relativities. The man who started on £3,000 was fifty per cent above the lowest level man, but after two years of the policy his income was only 147 per cent of the lowest level. The man starting at £5,000 fell from 250 to 227 per cent of the lowest level of pay, while the £8,000 man fell from 400 per cent to 338 per cent.

The next phase of the incomes policy must allow more generous treatment of the workers who exercise high degrees of skill and responsibility. This will not be possible until next August. It is all the more important that the April budget allows some tax-relief to all sections of the community, and that an incomes policy from next August allows at least the maintenance of present differentials. Any further relative narrowing would be undesirable. The next phase should, therefore, allow at least a uniform percentage increase without any ceiling. The lower paid should be helped primarily by being taken out of the income tax system altogether.

Taxation and the Poverty Trap

At the present time, workers are paying income tax when their earnings are so low that they are officially regarded as living in poverty and entitled to means tested benefits. A married man with two children and earning £35 a week will be paying income tax but also entitled to draw £3.50 in Family Income Supplement. There is no incentive at all for him to seek a better paid job or to work any overtime. Suppose he could increase his earnings by £5 a week. What happens? Income tax at 35 per cent takes £1.75 from him, and National Insurance contributions at 5¾ per cent another 29p. His Family Income Supplement will be reduced by £2.50. This accounts for £4.54 of his £5 increase, and he may lose something in the way of other means tested benefits as well.

If, however, the Chancellor is to be able to make the tax reductions he has admitted are necessary, he will have to make absolutely certain that government expenditure is rigidly controlled.

Any Questions?

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

Are Catholics free to accept the existence of the subconscious mind?

In honesty, they are bound to accept facts when they are demonstrated; but in prudence they should carefully examine the reasons given to support theories.

I think it is generally agreed that the mind is always working, even when we do not deliberately set it in motion and do not advert to its processes and findings. One of the benefits of preparing, in the evening, for tomorrow's Mass or tomorrow's morning prayer, is that today's thoughts seem to ripen during sleep. A jumble of ideas can become, overnight, a unified theme. I think it is also clear that the mind can hold ideas and experiences to which, out of fear, it will not advert. They are kept below the level of consciousness. Sometimes mental health requires that they be brought to the surface.

Psychology and psychiatry are subjects for specialists, of whom I am not one. The specialists, however, belong to different schools of thought, and enquirers like ourselves should marshal what we know for certain as a help in choosing a specialist from whom to learn. We know that every human being is a person; that a person, by our definition, has a spiritual soul and is essentially free and responsible. We should reject out of hand the theory that "the unconscious directs everything in us, both the physical and the moral", as well as any other version of determinism that denies essential freedom. The scientific investigations of the experts can be judged by the standards of experimental science. Many of their discoveries are of immense value for an understanding of the human mind. But every expert has a philosophy of some kind; and we need to satisfy ourselves that those philosophies are sound.

How, in these days, can Catholics be "the light of the world"? Observers no longer admire the

Church: they just look for the latest signs of disintegration.

For a light to serve as a guide, its source must be known. The lights on our coast-line would be of no use to seafarers without knowledge of their exact location. The light shed by a Catholic should be recognizably Catholic, and so point the way to the Church founded by Christ, to Christ's full revelation, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Blessed Sacrament and the other sacraments, and the divine truths safeguarded within the Church by the Holy Spirit. So, how to be recognizably Catholic?

Time was when Catholics all held firmly to the same doctrines and all performed the same religious duties. If they managed to live in the likeness of Christ, their life recommended the Church. Throughout the world they were one in belief and worship, one in obedience to the Vicar of Christ. They were different from all others: their shining was specific. Now it seems that they are ashamed of being different; and they try to take the colour of their background and to be indistinguishable from the rest. They are not Catholics but chameleons, hiding themselves in their setting, whatever it happens to be — humanism, Marxism, Protestantism, secularism. A writer in *The Times* in October, 1976, thought theological pluralism, spreading unchecked, would lead to "the destruction of the Church in any historically recognizable form". What is emerging is "a church that opposes nothing; that, for fear of giving offence, always sits down to be counted". Unity, that first mark of the Church, is at present obscured. All the greater, then, is the obligation of each Catholic to be a faithful and genuine member of the Church, the Body of Christ. How? Get hold of the new Faith pamphlet by Fr. Brendan McCarthy: "Roman Catholic . . . not just a Label" (Faith Pamphlets, 2 Redford Avenue, Wallington, Surrey. SM6 9DP). It is the answer to your question.

Is faith still a virtue when it is "dead"?

Faith is the primary virtue and, in this life, the most persistent. It must come first, to give hope and charity their object. As the Council of Trent says, it is the beginning and

the basis of our salvation and sanctification; and it must continue to the end, for without it all other virtues would be aimless and meaningless, and there could be no welcome for the grace of final repentance. But it has two states, that of life and that of death. St. James says in his Epistle (2:17): "Faith, if it have not works, is dead in itself". In that state, faith is not a Christian virtue: it can be a Christian virtue only in the company of hope and charity. Technically it is called "faith without form" — "form" being the life of the Holy Spirit. As St. Paul says, faith has to be lived; and it produces evidence of its life in fruits, which are the goodnesses of all the other virtues.

But dead faith is still belief. Of what sort? St. Augustine describes faith in its two states. Of the dead state he says that it is *credere Deum*: to believe that there is a God, and that all He tells us, directly or through the Church, is true. It is that faith which the devils have, and it is no virtue. "Thou believest that there is one God. Thou doest well. The devils also believe, and tremble". But at least that dead faith can make the human believer receptive of the grace of repentance. Living faith, in St. Augustine's terms, is *credere in Deum*: the choice of God as one's end in life and one's supreme love. That is the faith of the martyrs, and also, in a lesser but sufficient degree, of those who, though sinners, are still faithful with "the faith that worketh by charity" (Gal. 5:6).

How far were Pius XII's plans for reform of the liturgy taken into account in the preparation of the *Novus Ordo*?

I do not know what you have in mind when you talk of Pius XII's plans. That he was deeply concerned for the liturgy is clear from his Allocution in 1956 to liturgical experts meeting in Assisi. He there expresses his satisfaction at revived interest in the liturgy which is prompted, he says, by the Holy Spirit. The clearest evidence of his concern is the Encyclical "Mediator Dei" of 1947, which is a masterly and inspiring summary of the principles and practice of Christian worship. The Apostolic Constitution and the General Instruction printed at the front of the 1971 Missal refer to the Allocution mentioned above, and also, in support of the Church's

teaching on the Real Presence, to Pius XII's Encyclical "Humani Generis". There is no reference to "Mediator Dei". That is not surprising: many post-conciliar changes are foreign to the spirit of the Encyclical. Pius XII, like Vatican Council II, thought that a limited adoption of the vernacular could be of great benefit to the faithful: but he affirmed, as Pius XI had done and as John XXIII would do in his Constitution "Veterum Sapientia": "The use of the Latin language prevailing in a great part of the Church affords at once an imposing sign of unity and an effective safeguard against the corruption of true doctrine". And what of this passage? "It would be wrong to want the altar restored to its ancient form of table; to want black eliminated from the liturgical colours, and pictures and statues excluded from our churches; to require crucifixes that do not represent the bitter sufferings of the divine Redeemer". You may not like those two quotations from "Mediator Dei"; but you could profitably read the whole Encyclical for its rich and warm exposition of the unchanging doctrine of the Mass and the Blessed Sacrament.

"A Church that is universal must have a universal tongue, whilst a national church, or a church whose members speak one and the same language, and whose doctrines conveniently change to suit the times, can safely adopt the vernacular tongue in its liturgy." Cardinal Gibbons, "Maxima".

Book Review

CANDID COMMENTARY

Pope John's Council by Michael Davies; Augustine Publishing Company, South View, Chawleigh, Chulmleigh, Devon EX18 7HL; pp. 336, £2.50 (post-free £2.75). Also obtainable from Pro Fide Book Service, 39, Blenheim Park Road, South Croydon, Surrey, England. This book may be purchased by readers in all countries EXCEPT the United States, where special arrangements have been made for its publication. Please note this.

The authorship of this book provides in itself a sufficient commentary on the times in which we live within the Church. Twenty years ago one would have expected, say, a distinguished priest-scholar to have produced a work of this calibre. Not so today. The priest-scholars of the present are either progressive in their writing, or, if orthodox, put out to grass by progressive or cowardly ecclesiastical religious superiors, or victims of a bogus interpretation of the virtue of obedience that has left them with their heads down, timid and afraid. Thus it is that the treason in clerical and religious ranks, which has brought the Church to its present pass, has gone largely unchallenged within those same ranks. As a result, the job of defending the Church has gone, largely by default, to the laity. Thus it is that this book under review — the second in a series of which the first, *Cranmer's Godly Order*, sold out in six months — has been written by a young layman, who is a hard-working school-teacher and the Father of four small children. I salute him, not only for the excellence of his work, which could not have been produced at a more opportune moment; but for the courage and self-sacrifice that has gone to the making of the present volume.

The contrast between this young layman, burning the midnight oil to produce a work in defence of the Faith and the gaggle (or giggle) of progressive priests and religious who use their abundance of time and financial resources to work for what amounts to its destruction, is not a pretty one. Moreover, it speaks loudly of injustice. One would have thought that an effort of this sort, written to alert all to post-

conciliar trends which bid fair to destroy the Church, would have been promoted financially, at least in part, by the Hierarchy's Development Fund or whatever it is called. But not so. That fund, built up out of moneys collected from the Faithful, goes steadily to operations whose long-term effect in not a few cases will be to assist in the destruction of the Church. When, however, it comes to any operation in defence of the Faith no money at all is forthcoming (not that any was asked for in this case). Michael Davies' fine book is the work of private enterprise and great self-sacrifice on the part of himself and his publisher. This is the first reason why it will succeed; it is the fruit not only of scholarship, but of selflessness in defence of the truth. The irony, however, remains. So does the injustice. One would have thought that a work in defence of the Faith would have received at least from Ecclesiastical Authority a fraction of the financial assistance granted to those which encourage its destruction. Not so today, I am afraid. "Quos Deus vult perdere prius dementat".

The second reason why this book will succeed is that it tells the truth. There is no fanatical denunciation of the Second Vatican Council here; neither is there a cover-up. What you get is a balanced, cool appraisal based not on empty conjecture, but on fact. Michael Davies' best chapters, perhaps, are the first four which show clearly and conclusively how the Rhine Group of Council Fathers, based mainly on Germany, France and Holland, came to the Council so well prepared and so ruthlessly organised that they took over the Council from the start and in as competent a fashion as the Communists took over Hungary in the wake of World War II. Readers should realise that this is no exaggeration. The story was told originally by Father Ralph M. Wiltgen, SVD in his *Rhine Flows into the Tiber*, which slipped slowly and strangely out of print some years ago, but is once more in demand as the unease of so many Catholics turns into anguish with the passing of the post-conciliar years (Wiltgen, incidentally, is no fanatic at all; simply a good, because painstaking, and somewhat plodding journalist). Having read both works, I have no hesitation in saying that Michael Davies sets the conciliar scene in clearer perspective than even Father Wiltgen does, and that is saying something; but there need be no surprise at this. History written too close to

the event is necessarily blurred through almost inevitable lack of background. Davies sets the Council in focus as Wiltgen never did. Great though his debt to the priest-journalist is, he has been able to draw on other sources and events, which he has done with skill and great objectivity to present a true picture of the Council which should be studied, prayed over and acted on by all who love the Church.

If I had to pick out the chapters which I found most helpful, apart from those which present so clear a picture of the Council and the forces converging on it, I would select, in the first place, that which gives what is, I think myself, a truthful and, because truthful, loyal presentation of Pope Paul in his relationship to the Council and the developments and orientations that flowed from it. I imagine that this was the hardest chapter that Davies had to write and he was a brave man to write it, for he must have known as he did so that it would reap him a fine harvest of abuse from Right as well as Left within the Church. Fanatics amongst the former will blast him for not going far enough; way-outers amongst the latter will smear him for having gone too far (as if they could talk; but, then, they are double-speakers, particularly in this regard). Meanwhile, timid middle-roaders within the Church, who confuse loyalty with sycophancy and, without knowing it, degrade the Papacy by turning the incumbent of the Chair of Peter into some sort of Satrap, will be very quick to accuse Davies of "Disobedience" — one of the words most abused within the post-conciliar Church, particularly by its Bishops. In fact, Davies is none of these things. He is critical certainly, but responsibly and respectfully and rightfully so. There is no servility about him, but since when has servility been a Christian virtue? We serve — and we are meant to serve — the Church and the Holy Father as *human beings*; which means always responsibly and freely, but never with servility and as slaves. What shines out from between the lines of this immensely important chapter is the total loyalty of Michael Davies to the Holy Father and to the Church. Contrary to what far too many think today, this is not manifested by an unholy and brainless concentration on the mere formalities of obedience as distinct from its substance. Indeed, it was precisely this unthinking concentration within the Church in pre-conciliar days which hastened the post-conciliar upheaval; and which is now being used,

Interestingly enough, by progressive enemies within the Church to prevent so many fine Catholics, particularly within the ranks of the diocesan clergy and religious orders, from offering effective resistance to the near-total disintegration which the contemporary near-modernist attack is bringing to it. "Keeping right with Rome" or with one's Bishop or Religious Superior is not to be identified with loyalty to the Holy See. The tendency of Bishops, clergy and religious to do precisely this is in no way incompatible with treason: their pretended allegiance to this false principle, which is only a refuge for their moral cowardice, accounts in large part for the speed of the present collapse within the post-conciliar Church.

I can do no more than mention two other chapters. Firstly, that which seeks to evaluate the Council documents and which will do a great deal of good to those who are puzzled as to what sort of assent they command; all the more so in view of the impression given by so many progressive clerics that they should be accepted in their entirety — nuances and ambiguities and all — without question. This, of course, is nonsense, but few of the laity know that it is or that the unquestioning assent demanded of them by Progressives is, in many cases, not to the Council documents, but to reforms that have been extracted from them without any true warrant as being, so we are told, in "the spirit of Vatican II". Secondly, a well researched chapter showing how, in the case of the liturgy, ambiguity of presentation and the entrusting of its work to "experts" has given Progressives a free hand to make of liturgical reform the mess that they have.

Wisely enough, the Author has placed in the form of Appendices the treatment of several important subjects that bear strongly on his main thesis. Thus, for example, an extraordinarily interesting piece of writing which shows the expectations of the World Press with regard to the First Vatican Council as identical, really, with their hopes for the Second. Again, there is reproduced in appendix form the translation of a fine piece of prophetic writing by Dom Gueranger in 1830 on "The Liturgical Heresy"; also a fascinating critique by the young Louis Salleron of the young Jacques Maritain's *True Humanism* when it first appeared in the thirties; a critique that gives great insight into the stance of Pope Paul with regard to contemporary post-conciliar

orientations, for the Holy Father was, without a doubt, very strongly influenced by Maritain's book when a young cleric, and I think, as do many others, that he has remained so. If the conjecture is true, much that puzzles and confuses with regard to post-conciliar Vatican policy and practice begins to come very clear.

Last July when Cranmer's *Godly Order* — Davies' first book in his trilogy, of which Pope John's Council is the second — appeared, it was, of course, ignored by the official Catholic Press. It was very favourably reviewed by what might be called the contemporary Catholic Samizdat or "underground" Press, which continues to grow in circulation as the official organs deservedly decline. Its first printing of 5,000 copies was sold out by November of last year; that is, in six months (There is, I believe, a reprint now in preparation). This volume, I think, will do even better. It is what we have all been waiting for; not only, knowingly, but, in many cases, unknowingly, if I may put it that way. By this I mean that there are many, very many bishops, priests and religious who feel the need for a book of this sort. And why? Because they need the truthful and balanced perspective that it offers. Once this is gained, as it will be if they read the book reflectively and with an open mind, we shall see built up the first beginnings of a climate of opinion within which, at last, sanity will be restored. The best thing I can say about this book is that it is absolutely sane; and sanity is what we require in the Church more than anything else at the present time.

I am more grateful than I can say to Michael Davies for having produced it. I recommend it without reserve. I would ask readers to make an all-out effort to buy it and read it and pass it to others in need. The effect of its wide circulation could be, indeed, profound.

Paul Crane, S.J.